

**Tongues, Prophecy
and the Problem of Judgement by Outsiders:
Reading 1 Corinthians 14:20-25 in Regular Order.**

A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of
Master Of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Humanities

2015

Sungjong Kim

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

Contents

Contents	- 2
Abbreviations	- 6
Abstract	- 12
Declaration	- 13
Copyright Statement	- 14
Acknowledgments	- 15
Dedication	- 16
1. An exegetical problem in reading 1 Cor 14.20-25: logical inconsistency between v. 22 and vv. 23-25 and the necessity for an alternative structure of 14.20-38	- 17
1.1. A difficulty in revealing Paul the Apostle's coherent logic in the existing structure of 14.20-25	- 18
1.2. Scholarly endeavour to solve the logical coherence of 14.22 within 14.20-25 and the necessity for an alternative structure of 14.20-38	- 21
1.3. Reading 14.20-25 within an alternative structure of 14.20-38	- 24
1.3.1. Reading 14.20-25 in regular order	- 25
1.3.2. Two scenarios of tongues	- 31
1.4. The plan of the subsequent chapters of the thesis	- 34
2. Re-reading the structure of 1 Corinthians	- 39
2.1. The integrity and coherence of 1 Corinthians	- 39
2.2. A table of the structure of 1 Corinthians	- 44
2.3. An explanation of the structure of 1 Corinthians	- 47
3. Re-reading the structure of 1 Corinthians 14	- 76
3.1. A table of the structure of 1 Cor 14 in Greek and English	- 76
3.1.1. A table of the structure of 1 Cor 14 in Greek	- 76
3.1.2. A table of the structure of 1 Cor in English	- 80

3.2.	Critical survey of scholarly views on the structure of 1 Cor 14	- 85
3.3.	The explanation of the structure of 1 Cor 14	- 92
3.3.1.	Intelligible speech for building up the church (14.1-19)	- 92
3.3.1.1.	Prophecy builds up the church (14.1-5a)	- 94
3.3.1.2.	Interpretation builds up the church (14.5b-13)	- 95
3.3.1.3.	Singing and speaking in the spirit and in the mind build up the church (14.14-19)	- 100
3.3.2.	The proper application of the gifts of the Spirit with perfect wisdom, building up with love and the God of peace (14.20-38)	- 102
3.3.2.1.	Perfect wisdom and the proper application of the gifts of the Spirit (14.20-25)	- 107
3.3.2.2.	Perfect wisdom: interpretation of tongues and discernment of prophecy (14.26-31)	- 117
3.3.2.3.	Paul the Apostle's warning to the Corinthian prophetesses' puffing up (14.32-38)	- 119
3.3.3.	Conclusive admonition (14.39-40)	- 123
3.4.	Conclusion	- 124
4.	A possible scenario of silent tongue in 1 Cor 14.10 (<i>ἄφωρον</i>) and <i>speaking into air</i> in 14.9 as Paul the Apostle's worry-	128
4.1.	Philosophical speech without sound and in silence in the Hellenistic-Jewish world	- 129
4.1.1.	Philosophical speech with sound and in silence in Philo	- 129
4.1.2.	Philosophical speech in Lucretius	- 136
4.2.	The Corinthian church's practice of silent tongue Christianized from Philo	- 140
4.2.1.	The Corinthian tongue in silence analogous to that of Philo	- 140

4.2.2.	The Christianization of silent tongue found in the Apostle Paul	- 142
4.2.3.	The Corinthian strong believers' wicked and foolish application of the Christianized silent tongue	- 144
4.3.	Paul the Apostle's worry about silent tongue: <i>speaking into the air</i> as speaking into the lower-heavenly sphere in Philo	- 145
5.	Two sources of the law the Apostle Paul cited in 1 Cor 14.21	- 151
5.1.	The source of the law in 14.21	- 151
5.2.	A tongue and a lip in the <i>Hodayot</i>	- 156
5.2.1.	Linguistic sameness and modification to Isa 28.11 in the <i>Hodayot</i>	- 156
5.2.2.	Thematic tension in the <i>Hodayot</i> as to a lip and a tongue	- 157
5.3.	The tradition of two <i>Hodayot</i> and Isa 28.11 LXX in 1 Cor 14.21	- 159
5.3.1.	The linguistic closeness of 1 Cor 14.21 to the tradition of two <i>Hodayot</i>	- 159
5.3.2.	Intertextuality of τῶ λαῶ τούτῳ between Isa 28.11 LXX and 1 Cor 14.21 and its meaning within 14.20-38	- 161
5.4.	Conclusion	- 164
6.	μαίνεσθε as the opinion of unbelievers in 1 Cor 14.23	- 166
6.1.	Unbelievers in 14.23: the priority of Jewish identity over non-Jewish identity	- 168
6.1.1.	Identifying ἰδιῶται as catechumens in the coherent structure of 14.20-25	- 169
6.1.2.	An inclination of catechumens unbaptised and unbelievers toward the priority of Jewish identity	- 170
6.1.2.1.	Unbaptised catechumen's ἀμὴν to the prayer of thanksgiving in the Jewish-Christian educational atmosphere in 14.16	- 171
6.1.2.2.	Categorization of unbelievers into this people in the logic of 14.21-23	- 172

6.1.3. τούς ἐξουθενημένους of 6.4 and ιδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ and unbaptised catechumens' judgement on what believers said in 14.23	- 173
6.2. Well-educated unbelievers and less-educated unbelievers, and their responses as μαίνεσθε	- 176
6.2.1. Well-educated unbelievers and μαίνεσθε	- 177
6.2.2. The less-educated God-fearing unbelievers and a prophetic frenzy	- 179
6.3. Intelligent Gentile unbelievers' response to two tongues	- 182
6.3.1. Greek speech in Protagoras	- 183
6.3.2. Philosophical discourse from the golden age to Lucretius	- 185
6.4. Conclusion	- 188
7. ἀγάπη and τὰ πνευματικά, and Paul the Apostle's genuine idea of the application of prophecy	- 190
7.1. ἀγάπη and τὰ πνευματικά as Paul the Apostle's pictorial images of the church	-192
7.1.1. Problems within the Corinthian church	- 192
7.1.2. ἀγάπη as Christian morality for building up God's building	- 195
7.1.3. Faithfulness as Christian morality for unifying the body into one in variety of τὰ πνευματικά sown in God's field	- 198
7.2. Paul the Apostle's idea of the proper application of prophecy in relation to judgment	- 202
7.2.1. Believers' application of prophecy to ἀνακρίνω in opposition to ἀγάπη	- 203
7.2.2. An unbeliever weighing up what a believer prophesied in the light of Christian faithfulness (who should judge and weigh a believer's words and actions?)	- 206
Conclusion	- 210
Bibliography	- 212

Word number: 70,667

Abbreviations

1. Ancient Texts

A: Aeschylus

Pers: Persian

Aj: Ajax

Ant: Josephus, Jewish Antiquities

Hdt.: Herodotus

Herm. Sim.: Hermas, Similitude

Herm *Vis.*: Hermas, Vision

Dial: Justin, Dialogue with Trypho

Luc: Lucian

Alex.: Alexander the False Prophet

Ind: The Ignorant Book-Collector

Philo

Abr: *De Abrahamo*

Agri: *De agricultura*

Cher: *De cherubim*

Conf: *De confusion linguarum*

Congr: *De congressu eruditionis gratia*

Dec: *De decalogo*

Ebr: *De ebrietate*

Fuga: De fuga et inventione

Gig: De gigantibus

Heres: Quis rerum divinarum heres

Jos: De Iosepho

Leg All: Legum allegoriae I-III

Migr: De migratione Abrahami

Mut: De mutatione nominum

Op: De opificio mundi

Plant: De plantatione

Post: De posteritate Caini

Quaes Gen: Quaestiones et solutions in Genesin

Quod Det: Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat

Quod Deus: Quod dues immutabilis sit

Quod Omn: Quod Omnis probus liber sit

Sacr: De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini

Somn: De somniis I-II

Spec Leg: De specialibus legibus I-IV

Vita Mos: De vita Mosis I-II

Pir Abo: Pirke Aboth

Plato *Cra.*: Plato Cratylus

S: Sophocles

2. Modern Materials

AAnth: American Anthropologist

AB: The Anchor Bible

ABD: The Anchor Bible Dictionary

AJPS: Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies

AnthC: Anthropology of Consciousness

BAGD: W. Bauer, W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, and F.W. Danker. 1979. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. 2d ed. Chicago.

BDF: F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (R.W. Funk trans)

BST: Brandeis Studies and Texts

CBQ: The Catholic Biblical Quarterly

CEC: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary

Comm: Commentator

CPNIVC: The College Press NIV Commentary

CTR: Criswell Theological Review

CUOS: Columbia University Oriental Studies

DCH: The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew

DLNTD: Dictionary of the Later New Testament & Its Developments

DPHL: Dictionary of Paul and His Letters

ÉB: Études Bibliques

Ed: Editor

EDNT: Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament

EFH: Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt

EKK: Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament

ET: Evangelische Theologie

ETIEN: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997)

GM: Göttingen Miscellen

Grimm-Thayer: A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti

H-CHCB: Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible

HALOT: The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament

HELOT: Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic

HR: History of Religions

IBCTP: Interpretation: a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching

INT: Interpretation

IS: Iranian Studies

IVP: InterVarsity Press

IVP NTCS: InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series

JBL: Journal of Biblical Literature

JBPR: Journal of Biblical and Pneumatological Research

JJRS: Japanese Journal of Religious Studies

JPT: Journal of Pentecostal Theology

JSNT: Journal for the Study of the New Testament

JSNTSS: Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series

JSOT: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series

JTS: Journal of Theological Studies

JThS: Journal of Theological Studies

KNTS: Korean New Testament Society

LSJ: Liddell-Scott Jones Greek-English lexicon

MANTC: MacArthur New Testament Commentary

MIT: McDonald Idiomatic Translation of the New Testament

MNTC: Moffatt New Testament Commentary

NCBC: New Cambridge Bible Commentary

NIBC: New International Biblical Commentary

NICNT: The New International Commentary on the New Testament

NICOT: The New International Commentary on the Old Testament

NIGTC: New International Greek Testament Commentary

NovT: Novum Testamentum

NRS: New Revised Standard Version

NTD: Neue Testament Deutsch

NTS: New Testament Studies

OBC: The Oxford Bible Commentary

PJBR: The Polish Journal of Biblical Research

SBL: Society of Biblical Literature

SBeTh: Studia Biblical et Theologica

SBLDS: Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series

SPA: The Studia Philonica Annual

SPS: Sacra Pagina Series

TDNT: Theological Dictionary of the New Testament

TE: Theological Education

TNTC: Tyndale New Testament Commentaries

Trans: Translation

Tr: Treatise

WBC: Word Biblical Commentary

WThJ: Westminster Theological Journal

ZNW: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

Abstract

The aim of this study is to evaluate and validate a possible reading of 1 Corinthians 14.20-25 in regular order. The main finding of this study can be summarized as follows.

- a. In a contradiction between 14.22 and 14.23-25, 14.22 is not Paul the Apostle's logical mistake, but his pastoral wisdom to remedy a conflict between the strong and the weak within the divisions of the Corinthian church. Paul's plan is for two or three to speak, with other believers weighing this, whereas, problematically, all are speaking and non-believers are judging. This contradicts the principle set out in 6.1-11. It also exacerbates the Corinthian divisions because the judgement of the non-believers will tend to favour the 'strong'.
- b. The second finding is another interpretive possibility of tongue described in 1 Cor 14 as silent tongue.
- c. The third finding is a relationship between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the law of 1 Corinthians 14.21. This thesis explained on how this finding is related to a conflict between the strong and the weak centering around speaking in tongues.

The results of this study indicate that 14.23-25 can be read as Paul the Apostle's worry over the Corinthian church's wrong application of the gifts of the Holy Spirit by which outsiders might judge believers' speech and actions.

Declaration

No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Copyright Statement

- i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the “Copyright”) and he has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.
- ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made **only** in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.
- iii. The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trade marks and other intellectual property (the “Intellectual Property”) and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.
- iv. Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialization of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=487>), in any relevant Thesis restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library’s regulations (see <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/library/aboutus/regulations>) and in The University’s policy on Presentation of Thesis.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Peter Oakes and my co-supervisor Prof. George Brooke for their priceless suggestions, and to Dr. Jean-Marc Dreyfus for his help as a panel member.

Dedication

**To my God, all of His churches, my wife, my parents and my two sons
with greatest appreciation,
my most profound gratitude,
and my deepest love**

1. An exegetical problem in reading 1 Cor 14.20-25: logical inconsistency between v. 22 and vv. 23-25 and the necessity for an alternative structure of 14.20-38

This thesis will discuss an exegetical problem in 1 Cor 14.20-25 in which there appears logical inconsistency between v. 22 and vv. 23-25 and present the necessity of reading 14.22-25 in an alternative structure of 14.20-38. Previously, scholars have argued for 'reading vv. 22-25 from the bottom' in the structure of 14.20-25, considering v. 22 as the author's logical mistake. However, I am going to argue that once vv. 20-25 is read in regular order in the structure of 14.20-38, we can find not only linguistic coherence between vv. 21-22 but compatibility between v. 22 and vv. 26-31(38) in which 14.23-25 are found to be contradictory to and surrounded by vv. 21-22 and vv.26-38. Accordingly, in this thesis I will attempt to read 14.20-25 in regular order within the new structure of 14.20-38 rather than reading v. 22 as St. Paul's logical mistake within the previous structure.

Then, I will explain the plan of the subsequent chapters of the thesis. Along with the necessity of reading v. 22 within the enlarged structure, something else I will address is the need for two scenarios of tongues in 1 Cor 14, namely tongue with sound and tongue in silence.¹ This thesis will show how the scenarios will have an impact on reading 14.20-25.

¹ For more discussion on this issue, see. Ch. 4 (Two scenarios of tongue in 1 Cor. 14).

1.1. A difficulty in revealing Paul the Apostle's coherent logic in the existing structure of 14.20-25

The first section will point out an exegetical difficulty of 14.20-23(25) in which it will be shown that 14.21-22 exhibits discontinuity with 14.23-25.

Firstly, the Apostle Paul's argument as to tongues looks full of inconsistencies in 1 Cor 12-14. D. Kim argues that there appears a contradiction in relation to St. Paul's attitude toward tongues between 12.30 and 14.5a.²

Do **all** speak in tongues? (1 Cor 12.30b)

- sceptical -

I would like **all** of you to speak in tongues (1 Cor 14.5a)

- positive -

Paul the Apostle uses the coherent expression 'all speak in tongues' in 12.30b; 14.5,23. This finding suggests that the Corinthian church members frequently spoke in tongues all together, when the whole church was assembled together in the same place (14.23). By the way there appears to be an inconsistency in St. Paul's view on tongues between 12.30b and 14.5a. He depicts glossolalia sceptically in 12:30b, but positively in 14:5a. Even though, in 14.5a, he says prophecy is far superior to it, at any rate, he still depicts both of the gifts positively. Without the "all" in 14:5a, it may

² D. Kim, '바울의 방언관: 고전 12.30b 과 14.5a 를 중심으로,' 한국신약학회, vol. 13 (2006), pp. 169-171. According to him, interpreting the two verses based on 12.30b, most scholars understand Paul's concept of tongues as negative.

appear not to be positive. It is likely that he was sceptical on glossolalia in 12.30, but very positive in 14.5a. More confusingly he maintains a dubious attitude at the end.

Do not forbid speaking in tongues (1 Cor 14.39b)

- dubious -

Consequently, it is still not clear whether Paul's position on tongues is negative, positive or if he gives tacit permission.³

Secondly, it is likely that the point of Paul's argument changes in 14.20-22. According to L. T. Johnson, Paul's concept of glossolalia is most summarised in 14.20-25.⁴ It looks comparatively easy to understand Paul's logic until 14.19 where he explains the reason that prophecy is superior to tongues. It is explained briefly in 14.4: 'Those who speak in a tongue build up themselves, but those who prophesy build up the church.' The gist of Paul's argument harmonises well with the subject of love in 1 Cor 13. However, it is difficult for readers to understand Paul's intention from 14.20. Paul's viewpoint changes in 14.20-22 which is a notoriously difficult problem in glossolalia studies. In addition to that, 14.22 does not match with 14.23-25. Nobody has been successful in giving a lucid answer to it so far. J. P. M. Sweet tried to solve this difficult problem, but recognised that he, too, is not sure of Paul the Apostle's assertion.⁵

³ Regarding categorization of scholarly opinions about Paul's idea of tongues-speaking into three (scepticism, unavoidable affirmation, and positive encouragement), refer to D. Kim, '바울의 방언관: 고전 12.30b 과 14.5a 를 중심으로,' pp. 169-191.

⁴ L. T. Johnson, 'Tongues, Gift of,' *ABD* 6 (D. N. Freedman ed) (London: Doubleday, 1992), p.600.

⁵ J. P. M. Sweet, 'A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia,' *NTS* 13 (1966-1967), pp. 242, 256.

Undoubtedly from 14.20f. the point of Paul's argument seems to begin to change and there is no more mention of prophecy's superiority to tongues until 14.38. Paul cites Isa 28.11 in 14.21 and in 14.22, he gives a new opinion: 'tongues are a sign not for/to believers but for/to unbelievers, while prophecy is not for/to unbelievers but for/to believers.' What is more, the opinion is contrary to 14.23-25. It is not understandable that no sooner has Paul explained the inappropriateness of tongues for public worship, even citing the law on purpose and the superiority of prophecy due to its intelligibility, he gives a definition of the gifts which is contrary to his previous logic. Héring pointed out this problem: 'why are speaking in tongues a sign for unbelievers and prophecy a sign for believers?'⁶

Apparently, Paul's tongues viewpoint in 14.22 is different from his existing tongues viewpoint (14.1-19). According to his existing viewpoint, tongues are for building up oneself, while on the other hand prophecy builds up the church (14.4). In this regard, prophecy is superior to tongues. Ironically, as explained before, most scholars identify 14.20-25 as best expressing Paul's glossolalia concept.⁷ Consequently, it is unlikely that commentators will successfully reveal Paul's concept of glossolalia without solving the difficult problem of 14.20-25.

It is not simple, however, for readers to understand Paul's real intention in 14.20-25. Luke T. Johnson also acknowledged it as a knotty problem. He claimed that Paul overturned the assertion of Corinthian glossolalists, "by showing that tongues are

⁶ Refer to A. C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: a Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000), p. 1122. However, as to Héring's question, Thiselton follows H. Conzelmann's standpoint for no apparent reason and explanation. Conzelmann says that 'speaking with tongues is a sign also for believers and prophecy has an effect also on unbelievers,' for, with tongues' unintelligible character and the prophecy's missionary effect, the Spirit plays an important role in them. H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: a Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (H-CCB; Philadelphia, Pa: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 242. Conzelmann's explanation, though, is not natural at all, since 14:22 is Paul's declaration depending on the law (14.21) and 14.23-25 is an explanation on it. Therefore, it is not proper to interpret the declaration (14.22) on the basis of the explanation (14.23-25).

⁷ Johnson, 'Tongues, Gift of.,' p. 600.

not an unambiguous sign of belief.”⁸ His claim looks perfectly understandable, except for the contradictory problem of 14.22 within 14.20-25.

What should we understand from 14.20-25 then? Without 14.22, it becomes clear. It looks like Paul explains why prophecy, not glossolalia, is useful for unbelievers in 14.23-25, since the outsiders can understand the content of prophecy and then can repent of their sins to God. As such, glossolalia, being unintelligible, is useless at public worship, whilst prophecy is a sign for both believers and unbelievers. This assertion seems to match the subject of love in ch. 13. Moreover, it looks like it well explains why prophecy is superior to glossolalia. As to prophecy, it is possible to read that Paul explains the omnipotence of prophecy except for 14.22. However, Paul reverses his existing assertion in 14.22. Regarding the difficult problem of 14.22, I will discuss this more in the discussion of the structure of 1 Cor 14 in ch. 3 of the thesis.

1.2. Scholarly endeavour to solve the logical coherence of 14.22 within 14.20-25 and the necessity for an alternative structure of 14.20-38

Why, then did St. Paul mention 14.22? There are broadly two scholarly positions on how to explain the structure of Paul’s logic in 14.21-23. Firstly, some interpret a sign of tongues of 14.22 negatively.⁹ According to this theory, the reason St. Paul cited the law in 14.21 is that he wanted to teach the Corinthians that they should be

⁸ Johnson, ‘Tongues, Gift of.,’ p. 600.

⁹ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1123. Also refer to C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968), p. 323; W. Grudem, ‘1 Cor 14.20-25: Prophecy and Tongues as Signs of God’s Attitude,’ *WThJ* 41 (1979), pp. 381-396; D. E. Lanier ‘With Stammering Lips and Another Tongue: 1 Cor 14.20-22 and Isa 28:11-12,’ *CTR* 5:2 (1991), pp. 259-286.

cautious with tongues-speaking, which brings judgment on those who do not listen to the Lord, and then, in 14.22-23, alerts them to an awareness of the error of their ways-that tongues are a sign for/to believers. On the contrary, prophecy is a favourable sign for/to His people. It seems to perfectly explain the logical coherence of 14.20-25.

However, this theory will have to answer to puzzling questions. Above all, why did Paul the Apostle arrange the words ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέρων in 1 Cor 14.21 differently and in the opposite direction from the expression διὰ φανλισμὸν χειλέων διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας in Isa 28.11 LXX thus weakening the direct connection between the two, if his intention in citing the law in 14.21 was to show that tongue would be understood as a sign of judgment? In addition to that, what was his genuine intension demonstrating linguistic coherence of τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ between Isa 28.11 LXX and 1 Cor 14.21?

Next, this theory will have to be able to explain the contradiction between 14.22b and 14.24-25 as to prophecy. In other words, what is the reason that St. Paul's saying in 14.22b that prophecy is a sign/gift not for/to unbelievers but for/to believers, conflicts with 14.24-25?

Second, some (H. Conzelmann¹⁰ and R. B. Hays¹¹) tried to solve the problem based on an assumption that 14.22 is Paul's logical mistake, while others (B. C. Johanson¹² and C. H. Talbert¹³) considered 14.22 to be Paul's rhetorical question, in which his implicative meaning opposed to the opinion of the Corinthian church is found. The latter is disputed by D. E. Garland in that the connective οὖν of 14.23 displays logical consequences rather than contradiction.¹⁴ In other words, if the view of the

¹⁰ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, p. 242.

¹¹ R. B. Hays, *First Corinthians*, IBCTP (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1977), pp. 239-240.

¹² B. C. Johanson, 'Tongues, A Sign for Unbelievers? A Structural and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians XIV. 20-25,' *NTS* 25 (1979), pp. 180-203.

¹³ C. H. Talbert, *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (New York: Crossroad, 1987), pp. 87-88.

¹⁴ D. E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2003), p. 649.

Corinthian church was reflected in 14.22 and 14.23 shows St. Paul's real idea, 14.23 should have started with an adversative conjunction rather than οὐν. Recently, R. J. Gladstone suggested rendering τοῖς πιστεύουσιν / ἀπίστοις into 'resulting in believers/unbelievers' and attempted to solve this problem.¹⁵ However, the translation is excessively free.

In a different way, J. F. M. Smit assumes 14.22 to be unbelievers' misunderstanding of glossolalia as pagan mania from the idols rather than the gift received from God.¹⁶ However, this assumption also has been refuted by D. E. Garland in that glossolalia, for St. Paul, is 'not a pagan vestige.'¹⁷ And then, is considering 14:22 'Paul's logical mistake' the most persuasive explanation? Should readers interpret 14:22 on the basis of 14:23-25?

However, all the aforementioned methods face another problem, which is the incompatibility of 14.23-25 with 14.26-31 in light of 14.22. The finding suggests that 14.23-25 bracketed by 14.(21-)22 and 14.26-31 where the Apostle Paul gave the Corinthian church a guiding principle that tongues are a sign not for/to believers but for/to unbelievers and prophecy is a sign/gift not for/to unbelievers but for/to believers, is explained as pastoral wisdom on Paul's part to prevent unbelievers' judgment on what believers said. On account of this, St. Paul ordered them that two or three speak at one time rather than that all speaking at the same time (14.27,29). If all speak in tongues, there will be no one who interprets what is said between believers and then unbelievers will judge believers' tongues-speaking rather than unbelievers listening to believers (14.23). If all prophesy, there will be no one who weighs what is said between believers and then unbelievers will weigh what believers said (14.24-25). Regarding the proper application of glossolalia, the words

¹⁵ R. J. Gladstone, 'Sign Language in the Assembly: How are Tongues as Signs to the Unbelievers in 1 Cor 14.20-25,' *AJPS* 2 (1999), pp. 184-189.

¹⁶ J. F. M. Smit, 'Tongues and Prophecy: Deciphering 1 Cor 14,22,' *Biblica* 75 (1994), pp. 175-190. Also see S. J. Chester, 'Divine Madness? Speaking in Tongues in 1 Corinthians 14.23,' *JSNT* 27.4 (2005), pp. 417-446.

¹⁷ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, p. 650.

'tongues' and 'unbelievers' are pluralised (γλώσσαις and ἄπιστοι in 14.23) and it implies that if all speak in tongues, it might cause divisions and chaos. In accordance with that, St. Paul teaches them that two, or at the most three, should speak in *each faithful friendship* (ἀνὰ μέρος; also see. 12.27) and one should interpret in order that unbelievers may listen to what believers say from each fellowship.

On the contrary with reference to prophecy, the word unbeliever is in the singular ἄπιστος in 14.24 and in accordance with that, with no ἀνὰ μέρος in 14.29. The reason that two or three speak to all believers and the others weigh what they prophesied in the whole assembly is that all weigh what a fellow believer prophesized, and all may learn and everyone be encouraged (14.22b,29-31).

Then, the Apostle Paul deals with the problem of women prophets puffing up in 14.32-38. Their monopolistic application of prophecy was contradictory to the equal application of the gift (14.36). He gives an order to them to submit to authority (ὑποτάσσω in 14.32,34). These findings therefore suggest that 14.22 be read in the new structure of 14.20-38.¹⁸

1.3. Reading 14.20-25 within an alternative structure of 14.20-38

There are two primary aims of this study: firstly, to read 14.20-25 in regular order in the structure of 14.20-38; secondly, to explain that it is possible to understand tongues described in ch. 14 within two scenarios with precedent in Jewish ideology – noisy tongues and silent tongues.¹⁹

¹⁸ All will be discussed more in ch. 3.

¹⁹ Regarding the explanation on how non-Jewish unbelievers responded to the two possible types of tongue, refer to ch. 6 of this thesis.

1.3.1. Reading 14.20-25 in regular order

First, as the linguistic coherence between v.21 and v.22 is connected to 14.23-25, a new fact about the inclination of unbelievers to prioritise Jewish identity appears with a reading of 14.20-25 in regular order, that has never been found in previous readings of 14.20-25 in which v. 22 was relegated to St. Paul's logical mistake. The reading of 14.20-25 in regular order leads readers to interpreting 14.23-25 as unbelievers' judgment on believers' speaking in tongues and prophesying within a Jewish background.

Second, 14.23-25 is not only surrounded by vv. 20-22 and vv. 26-38 but isolated as a logical contradiction within the structure of 14.20-38. The conditional conjunction *Ἐὰν* of 14.23-25 reflects the Apostle Paul's worry (refer to *ἐὰν* in 14.6-9,11,14,16) over unbelievers judging what is said by believers, strong believers' monopoly being approved by unbelievers and weak believers being vulnerable to estrangement and contempt owing to the strong believers' monopoly.²⁰

- a) A contradiction between 'all speak in tongues' and 'all prophesy' in 14.23-25 and 'two or three speak' in 14.27,29

Uniformity in practicing gifts in 14.23-25 that all the Corinthian church members speak at the same time is inconsistent with the proper application of gifts described in 14.27,29 ('two or three speak'). Moreover, 'all speaking in tongues' without interpretation is contradictory to Paul the Apostle's guiding principle explained in 14.5,13. On the contrary 14.21-22a is consistent with 14.27-28 and 14.22b is compatible with 14.29-31.

²⁰ Regarding an interpretive possibility of the strong believers' monopoly it will be further discussed below.

With respect to tongues, the gifts are a sign to unbelievers (14.22a). If all speak in tongues, in the absence of an interpreter among believers, it would cause believers to be judged by unbelievers and then, through that, tongues would become a sign of judgment to believers. Therefore, the disordered practice of tongues might obstruct the two groups, the strong and the weak, in making one body in Christ, because unbelievers judge tongues spoken by believers.²¹

Prophecy is a gift speaking to believers (14.22b). St. Paul says that ‘those who prophesy speak to other people for their upbuilding, encouragement and consolation (14.3). But if all prophesy, believers’s words would have to be weighed not by a fellow believer, but by an unbeliever. It would cause trouble in that, not only did unbelievers not receive τὰ πνευματικά sown in God’s field by St. Paul to build up the church with τὰ πνευματικά, in accordance with Paul and Apollos’ teaching but also they did not know moral faithfulness for a Christian in God’s wisdom to honour weak believers with φρεσίν. Accordingly, unbelievers’ judgment would have brought about strong believers’ dominance over weak believers, while weak believers were being despised. For that reason, St. Paul gave a guiding principle to the Corinthian church that tongues are a sign to unbelievers and prophecy is a gift speaking to believers (14.22), and the gifts should be applied in a form that two or three speak in order to be interpreted and weighed not by unbelievers but by fellow believers (14.26-31).

- b) A contradiction between unbelievers’ judgment on what is said by believers in 14.23-25 and believers’ interpreting and weighing what is said by fellow believers in 14.27,29

As well as all the Corinthian church’s synchronized speaking of the gifts of the Spirit, the unbelievers’ judgment on τὰ πνευματικά spoken by believers in 14.23-25

²¹ For the explanation of the reason, see below.

contradicts believers interpreting and weighing what is said by fellow believers in 14.27,29. To be more precise, there is a difference between judgment by plenty of unbelievers on tongues spoken by all believers (14.23) and an unbeliever's judgment on prophecy spoken by all believers (14.24-25). On the contrary many unbelievers' judgment on tongues spoken by all believers (14.23) is opposed to one believer's interpretation on tongues spoken by two or three (14.27). Besides, one unbeliever's judgment on prophecy spoken by all (14.24-25) is opposed to many fellow believers' weighing what is said by two or three (14.29).

1 Cor. 14.21-22 explains the situation of the Corinthian church. As to the case of noisy tongue, as all the church were puffed up with boasting, speaking mysteries and knowledge, the weak would have been passionate in speaking in tongues. However, the intellectual class of Jewish unbelievers who were familiar with the kind of traiditon of three *Hodayot* (1QH^a 10.18-19; 12.16-17; 26.12-16) probably were unwilling to listen to tongue spoken by believers when believers spoke in tongue to each other (14.23). Note the strong with $\gamma\nu\tilde{\omega}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ had exemption from the negative judgment by the unbelievers, but the weak did not (8.1f.). In this situation, the more believers spoke in tongue, the more that well-educated unbelievers would have judged them with a negative attitude, and the more speaking in tongue would have become a stumbling stone to the weak.

In this regard, the Apostle Paul said that "tongues are a sign not to believers but to unbelievers" (14.22), which is not inconsistent with his previous argument (14.16). The emphasis on tongue spoken to unbelievers was that, not only might unbelievers remove any misunderstanding on the Corinthian church's tongue and say ἀμήν to believers speaking interpreted tongues but divisions between believers might come to a settlement by peaceful means.

If the tongues depicted in ch. 14 indicate silent tongue, it is unlikely that all of the Corinthian church members were empowered with the gift (14.5). Those who were well equipped with the gift would have been puffed up in that they were capable of

speaking mysteries and γνῶσις with ἄδηλον ('uncertain'; see. 14.8) sound more than the others. In this case, when unbelievers judged what was spoken with silent tongue by believers and complimented the strong on their high-level speech art so that 'you are inspired' (μαίνεσθε), the weak would have been despised and lowered their heads in shame (1.26; 6.1f.; 11.22). The reason behind Paul's declaration of 14.22 can be explained as his pastoral wisdom to remedy an abuse happening at Corinth when weak πνευματικοί are judged by unbelievers (2.15; 14.23).

Regarding prophecy, the reason that St. Paul instructed the Corinthian church that prophecy should be spoken not to unbelievers but to believers is that believers cared to be approved by an unbeliever. If all prophesy, a wise unbeliever will judge it and approve some to be real prophets and say that "indeed God is among you" (14.25b). In this way, the Corinthian church's foolish application of prophecy might bring about strong believers' monopoly to be approved (14.36).

As opposed to a wise unbeliever's bestowing praise on some believers, St. Paul exhorts them to speak prophecy to believers in order, not only that they may be approved and built up by fellow believers, but also that an abuse of monopoly at the table of the Lord be remedied. If anyone prophesies, two or three speak and the others should weigh what is said. In this way, all prophesy one by one so that all may learn and every single person be approved (14.22,29-31). This is the reason why prophecy is greater than tongues in building up the church.

- c) A contradiction between 'all speak in tongues' and 'all prophesy' in 14.23-25 and 'be silent' in 14.28,30,34

ἀγάπη builds up the church (8.1). The Apostle Paul exhorted the Corinthian church to use all of the gifts of the Spirit for building up God's building with ἀγάπη (14.26). ἀγάπη seeks the advantage of the other rather than his or her own advantage (10.24,33; 13.5). The expressions 'all speak in tongues' and 'all prophesy' are opposed

to St. Paul's exhortation to them to "be silent" within the structure of 14.20-38. It is likely that due to lack of ἀγάπη, they were avid to seek their own advantage and exercise their own right to speak so that they all spoke at the same time.

With reference to speaking in tongues, all should be silent if there is no one to interpret among them. The Corinthian prophetesses would have boasted about their high-level art of prophecy, being puffed up that they were able to speak higher-heavenly mysteries and knowledge that weak believers did not reach (13.2; 14.2,36). It is likely that in both cases of tongues and prophecy, a little yeast of boasting about speaking mysteries and knowledge leavened the whole batch of dough (5.6; 12.30; 14.23). However, without interpretation, all speaking in tongues might cause chaos (14.5b-19,23,33) and jealousy and divisions (14.23; cf. 3.3) between the strong and the weak within the church. Consequently, the Apostle Paul exhorts them to be silent if there is no interpreter for the others' advantage.

With regard to prophesying, it is likely that the Corinthian church was boasting and puffed up in speaking mysteries and knowledge with prophecy (5.6; 8.1; 13.2). Even though prophecy builds up (14.3-4), they should have borne firmly in mind that "All things are lawful, but not all things are beneficial. All things are lawful, but not all things build up" (10.23). Thus, a guideline is given to them that two or three believers can prophesy but when something is disclosed to another person, the first should be silent and concede a right to speak to another person (14.30).

Furthermore, when strong believers clashed each other, weak believers could get caught in the crossfire. Even if a wise Jewish unbeliever judged prophecy spoken by believers very generously, weak believers would have been alienated by his or her approval of prophecy of high standard; after all, the unbeliever did not know Christianized perfect wisdom in mystery, in which even weak believers are *predestined before the ages* (προώρισεν···πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων in 2.7; also refer to Rom 8.29; 16.25) to be the firstborn within a large family and in accordance with that, they should be treated as honorable.

On the contrary ἀγάπη does not boast and is not puffed up (1 Cor 13.4), and furthermore, as explained above, it seeks not its own advantage but the advantage of the other (10.24; 13.5). Praise given by the wise unbeliever, namely, “indeed God is among you in 14.25” is a complete contrast to a prize from God given to those whom do not make full use of rights, which is introduced by St. Paul (9.17-18). Although prophets or prophetesses were in a more important location than others in the Apostle Paul’s absence from Corinth, the morality of ἀγάπη by which a prophet or prophetess provides a right to speak to another person or another group and be silent himself or herself, would be the greater way to build up the church.²²

Paul the Apostle’s direction to be silent in 14.28,30 is centralized among women prophets in 14.32-38 and the regulation of submission adds more pressure to it (14.32,24). Surely, the application of gifts based on the principle of anti-monopoly and equal opportunity, namely “two or three speak” and “be silent” presents a striking contrast to prophetesses’ monopolistic tendency in using prophecy founded on their arrogance that the word of God originates with them and they are the only ones it has reached (14.36).

In this regard, it was inevitable that Paul would apply sanctions to the Corinthian church on the disordered practice of gifts. St. Paul, in the absence of Apostles from Corinth gave them directions that prophets were subject to other prophets (14.32-38; cf. 12.28). Accordingly, it is likely that the reason why the Apostle Paul gave them regulations that prophecy was a gift speaking not to unbelievers but to believers, and women prophets should be silent, is to protect weak believers against contempt and being manipulated by strong believers’ monopoly.

In accordance with reading 14.20-25 in regular order, φρεσίν of 14.20 signifies wisdom based on ἀγάπη to cloth weak fellow believers with greater honour (12.23)

²² Regarding sitting down of prophets or the wise for giving judgment, refer to 6.5; 14.30 (12.28). Also see Ex 18.13-14; Judg 4.4-5; Rut 4.1-2; Isa 28.6; Psa 9.4 (9.5 in LXX); 69.12 (68.13 in LXX); Ac 23.3.

in which weak believers become wise in Christ (φρόνιμοι ἐν Χριστῷ), while strong believers become fools on account for Christ (μωροὶ διὰ Χριστόν) (4.10). In opposition to that, κακία of 14.20 is explained as a little leaven of boasting of strong believers by which the whole batch of dough is manipulated.

1.3.2. Two scenarios of tongue

Given that the expression τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ of 14.21 has linguistic sameness with Isa 28.11 (LXX) and the preceding evidence that St. Paul's latitude in arranging the phrase ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέρων is found in two *Hodayot* (1QH^a 10.7,18-19; 12.16-17), and furthermore, an assumption that at least some of St. Paul's contemporary wise Jewish unbelievers would have known the tradition of two *Hodayot*, we may suppose that reflecting the situation of the Corinthian church, the Apostle Paul would have conflated two laws (Isa 28.11 LXX and the two *Hodayot*) into the law of 1 Cor 14.21.

No previous study has investigated the possibility so far that there might appear two scenarios of tongues in ch. 14 so that they have somewhat missed the point of the context of 14.21-23. In this thesis, however, it will be argued that there are two possible types of tongues: glossolalia with sound and glossolalia without sound. This thesis will assert that Philo, *Heres* 14-16, which treats philosophical speech in silence analogously to 1 Cor 14.2.²³ Furthermore, it is assumed that the Greek ἄδηλον and ἀέροα of 14.8-9 reflect the language of strong believers and the Greek ἄφωνον of 14.10 might indicate silent glossolalia. The thesis will consider how the two scenarios of tongue could influence the interpretation of 14.21-23 in which the negative anticipation that 'this people would not listen to the Lord' (14.21) will have to be variously explained in accordance with two scenarios of tongue in ch. 14.

²³ For more information, see. ch. 4 in this thesis (Two scenarios of tongue in ch. 14).

a. The case of noisy tongue

Regarding the first scenario of noisy tongue, even though the Lord spoke with tongue, the intellectual Jews would have been unwilling to listen to weak believers' tongue with sound due to a hostile attitude toward weird/strange tongue with sound.

It is through a subordinating conjunction "so" (ὥστε), and linguistic coherence between τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ of 14.21 and οὐ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπίστοις of 14.22 one finds a logical coherence between v.21 and v.22. In both of the two laws (Isa 28.11 LXX and two *Hodayot*), strange/weird tongue indicates tongue with sound. Moreover, there is a difference of interpretation of strange/weird tongue between Isa 28.11 LXX and two *Hodayot*. On the one hand, Isaiah describes it as the Lord's word given to Israel (this people) owing to their disobedience, and with respect to a connection between Isa 28.11 LXX and 1 Cor 14.21, regret at not having listened to the Lord's unintelligible word would have been comprised.

On the other hand in the *Hodayot*, the expression strange/weird tongue is delineated as a tongue of Belial to deceive which becomes a stumbling stone to fellow believers and with a connection between two *Hodayot* and the Corinthian situation reflected in 1 Cor 14.21, some well-educated Jews and Christians might have thought that speaking with tongue with sound should have been forbidden in the church. In this way, Paul's encouragement that 'I take pleasure in all of you to speak in tongues' (14.5) can be comprehended as an exhortation to form one body in Christ.

However, in the situation of the Corinthian church divided, why did the strong want to speak in tongue as well, when the whole church came together in the same place? The alternative structure of 14.20-38 suggests reading 14.23 as his worry over the wrong application of tongue. On this assumption, this thesis will state that the strong believers' manipulation of the weak into speaking in tongue is in order that be the weak judged by unbelievers, while the strong boast their freedom based on γνῶσις.

However, through the logical coherence between v. 21 and v.22, St. Paul's pastoral wisdom based on *φροσύνη* that is *wisdom in Christ* to give weak believers more advantages (4.10; 14.20) is proposed to cure division between the strong and the weak through making the two groups unified in the body of Christ (12.23-25). In 14.21, Paul the Apostle presents the law as direct evidence to show that what is spoken by believers should be judged by fellow believers. The Apostle Paul declares in 14.22 that tongues are a sign to *this people/unbelievers* in an endeavour to sort out the problem of an antipathy against weak believers caused by the negative attitude toward tongue with sound.

b. The case of silent tongue

If the tongue explained by Paul the Apostle in ch. 14 signifies tongue in silence rather than tongue with sound, his encouraging all of the Corinthian church members to speak in tongue (14.5) can be understood as reflecting that only some believers were equipped with the high-grade of speech art and the strong would have boasted of the tongue against the weak. If St. Paul knew the tradition of two *Hodayot* and τὰ πνευματικά he taught the Corinthian church reflected the law, his teaching on tongue in ch. 14 can be more dramatically read.

As such reading 14.20-25 in regular order within the new structure of 14.20-38 suggests understanding the reason that St. Paul cited the law in 14.21 as his encouragement that what was spoken by strong πνευματικοί would be approved that 'you are inspired' not by well-educated unbelievers but by weak πνευματικοί. The Apostle Paul changes the singular noun of tongue in Isa 28.11 LXX and two *Hodayot* (1QH^a 10.7,18-19; 12.16-17) into the plural noun of ἑτερογλώσσοις in 1 Cor 14.21 in which varieties of tongues can be included, even if the Corinthian silent tongue is different from the tongue with sound implied in the two kinds of laws. As the whole Corinthian church had a ritual to speak in silent tongue (14.23), the interpretation of the Greek μάλισθε can be divided into three according to the education level of unbelievers: a positive response by well-educated Jewish unbelievers aware of Philo ('you are inspired'), a negative response by Jewish unbelievers aware of *Hodayot* ('you are possessed by Belial') and a negative response to believers' action by less-educated Jewish unbelievers ('you are mad').

At any rate, no matter whether the tongue in ch. 14 indicates noisy tongue or mute tongue, this dissertation supposes that there probably was a conflict between the strong and the weak within the Corinthian church centering around speaking in tongues and two laws of Isa 28.11 and two *Hodayot*.

1.4. The plan of the subsequent chapters of the thesis

I will begin in chs. 2-3, to explain the coherent structure of the whole epistle of 1 Cor in which the structure of 1 Cor 14 will be set. In the introduction of our epistle (1.1-19), 1.9 is a key to understanding the letter. The faithfulness of God is the paradigm for His workers (1.9; 4.2) and St. Paul exhorts the Corinthian church to be imitators of him. The most serious problems in the Corinthian church were divisions and hostile individualism toward each other. In this situation, believers were about to leave unbelievers to judge their daily affairs in the church rather than fellow believers. What is more serious was that strong believers exposed weak believers' mistakes and disregarded them. This also became an issue in using the gifts of the Spirit. In this regard, this thesis will explain how faithfulness shows the Apostle Paul's pastoral wisdom in curing the church's ailment.

In ch. 4, I will explain the interpretive possibility that the tongues explained in ch. 14 might point to the Christianized silent glossolalia, on the assumption that the description in 14.2 is analogous to Philo, *Heres* 14-16 and that the Greek ἄφωνον of 14.10 can be translated into *without sound* rather than *meaningless*. The Corinthian speech with silent tongue would be analogous to that of Philo. I will compare the two to show how similar the two silent tongues were. Based on this evidence, this dissertation supposes a possibility that tongue spoken by the Corinthian church can be identified as glossolalia without sound preferred by strong believers.

In that case, the Corinthian silent tongue would be Christianized from that of Philo. First, the Corinthian church believers said a blessing and a thanksgiving at the table of the Lord. Second, the tongue belongs to τὰ πνευματικά which are the seeds of the Spirit sown by St. Paul in God's field (3.9; 9.11) and what is revealed only by the Spirit (2.12-14).

In ch. 5, I will explain that St. Paul probably conflated two sources into the law of 14.21. And then, I will look into the cause for mentioning the law within the structure of 14.20-38. It is likely that the two sources St. Paul referred to for the law in 14.21 were Isa 28.11 (LXX) and the kind of tradition evidenced in the two *Hodayot* (1QH^a 10.7,18-19; 12.16-17) where the way St. Paul cited each law was different. 1 Cor 14.21 has intertextual connections with τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ in Isa 28.11 (LXX); while the emphasis is not only on ἕτερος in the expression of ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χερίσιν ἑτέρων in 14.21a but 14.21b (not even will they listen to me) shows closeness to the tradition in the two *Hodayot* in linguistic and chronological aspects so more than Isa 28.11 (LXX). Isa 28.11-12 says that the Lord will speak to this people with stammering lip and with alien/weird tongue, because they did not listen to Him. Their disobedience to the Lord brought about unintelligible divine speech. On the contrary the tradition based on two *Hodayot* explains to us the Jews' unwillingness to use weird tongue considered as tongue of deceit.

Within the extended structure of 14.20-38, the force of the inter-textuality between Isa 28.11 LXX and 1 Cor 14.21, and of the linguistic coherence between 14.21-22, including a necessity for interpretation to satisfy the negative attitude toward uninterpreted tongue shown in the two *Hodayot*, reveal St. Paul's intention to correct the wrong application of the gifts of the Spirit with extreme individualism or egoism among the Corinthian church members. In this case, the strong believers' silence in interpreting what was spoken with noisy tongue by the weak would have been considered as the tongue of enemies by the weak's faithful believing friends such as St. Paul and the unnamed strong. The evil-extreme individualism is expected to be cured with the Apostle Paul's guideline for the wise application of tongues: *if anyone speaks in a tongue two or at the most three in each faithful friendship should speak and*

someone must interpret (εἴτε γλώσση τις λαλεῖ, κατὰ δύο ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τρεῖς καὶ ἀνὰ μέρος, καὶ εἷς διερμηνεύτω in 14.27).

At any rate, no matter whether tongue in ch. 14 indicates noisy glossolalia or silent glossolalia what was emphasized by St. Paul through the linguistic coherence between 14.21-22 was that tongue should be a sign not to believers but to unbelievers so that individualism or egoism rooted in puffing up and boasting which was one of the most serious problems²⁴ is remedied.

In ch. 6, I will examine how in the two scenarios of tongue the Greek μαίνεσθε of 14.23 will be able to be translated into in our structure of 14.20-38.

In addition to that, it might be speculated that the Corinthian unbelievers consisted of Jews and Gentiles. Above all, however, regarding the problem of identifying unbelievers in St. Paul's writing, readers will have to give priority to Jews and God-fearers who were more familiar with the Jewish-Christian educational system of the Corinthian church than Gentiles. The priority is explained not only through identifying *this people* with unbelievers in the linguistic coherence between 14.21-22, but through St. Paul's expectation that they would say ἀμήν to interpretation (14.16).

Furthermore, in 14.20-38, St. Paul expressed worry that unbelievers who had no knowledge of his πνευματικά might judge what was spoken by believers due to their wrong application of the gifts of the Spirit and make divisions within the church worse. Amidst this antagonism between believers, they dared to intend to appoint as judges unbelieving friends rather than fellow believers (6.1f.).

²⁴ Puffing up in 4.6,18-19, and boasting in 1.29,31; 3.21; 4.7; 5.6; 13.3,4; cf. 9.15-16; 15.31; esp. 'being puffed up on behalf of oneself against another' in 4.6; also see 1.11; 3.3.

Having shown in chapters 3-5, several interesting possible explanations of the relationship between tongues and the verdict, *μαίνεσθε*, in this chapter, I will explain the meaning of *μαίνεσθε* in 1 Cor 14.23 on the basis of the possible identities of unbelievers: Jews and Gentiles.

For Jewish hearers there are:

- a) intellectual Jews would have approved the possible Christianized philosophical speech in silence to be prime prophetic speech (*μανία* or *μαίνομαι* as 'you are inspired' in *Heres* 1.264-265; *Mut* 1.39; *Somn* 2.2; c.f. *Heres* 1.14,249), whilst less-intellectual Jews would have thought it madness;
- b) Jews aware of the kind of tradition of interpretation of Isa 28.11 shown in the two *Hodayot* would have seen tongue as 'weird', hence undesirable. [This speech could presumably be either audible or silent.] *μαίνεσθε* would be disapproving.

For Gentile hearer there are:

- a) Gentile unbelievers with the knowledge of Greek speech in Protagoras would have responded to either silent tongue or noisy tongue as *barbarianism*. *μαίνεσθε* would be disapproving;
- b) Gentile unbelievers with the knowledge of Greek speech in Stoic golden age would have recognized both of the Corinthian possible tongues as a language. In this case, *μαίνεσθε* would be approving.

In conclusion, the outsiders in 1 Cor 14.23 were probably Jews. However, judgment by outsiders was a problem for Paul the Apostle no matter whether the judgment was approving or disapproving, since they did not have the wisdom of τὰ πνευματικά taught to the Corinthian church by Paul.

In ch. 7, I will explain 1 Cor 14.24-25. Most scholars think that 14.24-25 describes the appropriate application of prophecy. However, I will critique this view and re-describe St. Paul's genuine idea of prophecy within the structure of 14.20-38. According to our enlarged structure, 14.24-25 is contradictory to St. Paul's regulation of prophecy shown in v.22 and vv. 29-31 that two or three prophets should speak to fellow believers in order that all weigh what they said and all may learn and be encouraged.

Firstly, I will show the Pauline ecclesiological concept in which ἀγάπη is portrayed as a building image and τὰ πνευματικά as an agricultural image. Secondly, I will describe St. Paul's idea of the proper application of prophecy according to these images of the church. Above all, in the building image of St. Paul's ἀγάπη, I will explain the proper application of prophecy as parallel to ἀγάπη. In here, it will also discuss the proper use of church tribunals. Next, in the agricultural image of St. Paul's πνευματικά, I will explain that prophecy should be weighed only by fellow believers. The Corinthian church believers appointed a wise unbeliever as a judge (6.1-6). 14.24-25 shows the Apostle Paul's worry that the Corinthian church believers used prophecy in the way that what was prophesied by believers might be weighed by a wise unbeliever. The reward of praise that ὄντως ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστίν (indeed God is among you) should have been received not from unbelievers but from fellow believers.

2. Re-reading the structure of 1 Corinthians

2.1. The integrity and coherence of 1 Corinthians

There has been a long debate among scholars over integrity of 1 Cor. J. Barclay points out that although 'our earliest papyri preserve the letter whole (e.g. P46, from c.200 CE), a number of scholars have argued that it is in fact a compound of several letters.'²⁵ Some claim that two, four, or more original letters were sewed into one epistle.²⁶ J. Barclay also says that the main issue, *inter alia*, is a problem of disconnection between ch. 1-4 and the rest because no term designating party divisions ever reappears in ch. 5-16 so that ch. 1-4 has been regarded as 'a self-contained letter.'²⁷ According to M. M. Mitchell, Hurd pointed out regarding the so called 'partition theories of 1 Corinthians' that '1 Cor 1-4 ('Letter C') does not concern the Corinthians' letter [7.1], but is solely concerned with the party divisions at Corinth of which Paul had learned from 'Chloe's people' [1.11]. *Paul's indignation over these dissensions appears absent from the rest of 1 Corinthians.*²⁸ On the contrary saying that 'Paul's varying rhetorical purposes can probably explain all the inconsistencies in this letter,' Barclay argued for the integrity of 1 Cor.²⁹ Scholars have endeavoured to have various theories about what makes 1 Corinthians coherent (e.g., social issues [D. G. Horrell, B. Witherington III], eschatology [Thiselton], gnostic ideas [W. Schmithals, D. R. Hall],³⁰ etc.).

²⁵ J. Barclay, '1 Corinthians,' in *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (J. Barton and J. Muddiman eds) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 1108.

²⁶ See. *ABD*, I, pp. 1142-1143; Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 36-37.

²⁷ Barclay, '1 Corinthians,' p. 1108.

²⁸ M. M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1992), p. 66; also see. J. C. Hurd Jr., *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983), p. 45.

²⁹ Barclay, '1 Corinthians,' pp. 1108-1109.

³⁰ W. Schmithals asserts the logical incoherency of the epistle with literary-critical analysis, whilst D. R. Hall finds the unity of the epistle through the verb *φουσιῶται* (to be puffed up). See. W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971), pp. 87-90; D. R.

However, scholars' discussion on the problem of the coherency within 1 Corinthians has tended to lay too much emphasis on *factionalism* (ἔρις in 1.11; 3.3 or σχίσμα in 1.10; 11.18; 12.25) so far, no matter whether incoherent or coherent (D. G. Horrell,³¹ Ben Witherington III,³² W. Schmithals,³³ D. R. Hall,³⁴ M. Gorman,³⁵ M. M. Mitchell³⁶). Recently, Thiselton, based on B. A. Pearson, maintains that 1 Cor 2.13b-16 'must be regarded as incorporating the terminology of the opponents' with 'the slogan of hyper-spiritual enthusiasts who see no need for any human leader' as opposed to the Apostle Paul's realistic eschatology.³⁷

However, I am suggesting a kind of thematic coherence produced by several interlinked factors. These are as follows:

1. The yeast of γνῶσις that puffs up and divides

Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence* (London: T&T Clark International, 2003), pp. 32,47.

³¹ D. G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), throughout.

³² B. Witherington III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1995), p. 75.

³³ Schmithals, *Gnosticisim in Corinth*, p. 91.

³⁴ Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, p. 30.

³⁵ M. J. Gorman, *Apostle of the Crucified Lord: A Theological Introduction to Paul and His Letters* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004), pp. 227-286.

³⁶ Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, throughout. She tried to read our epistle with deliberative rhetoric which makes the unifying issue a future goal within 1 Corinthians and said that 'the various questions of Corinthian debate (such as the problem of factionalism, the Corinthian description of their behaviour and the real social conditions in the church) become transformed into subordinate arguments in Paul's larger argument throughout 1 Corinthians for the reunification of the church' so that various political terms or *topoi* found 1 Cor 1-4 run throughout the rest of 1 Corinthians (the building metaphor, being "puffed up," the body metaphor, and the important term σχίσμα).

³⁷ A. C. Thiselton, 'Realized Eschatology at Corinth,' in *Christianity at Corinth* (E. Adams and D. G. Horrell eds.) (London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), pp. 107-118; *The First Epistle to the Corinthihans*, p. 252. Also refer to B. A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-psychikos terminology in 1 Corinthians; A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian opponents of Paul and its Relation to Gnosticism* (SBLDS 12; Montana, 1973), p. 38.

2. The ἀγάπη that unites and builds up
3. The spiritual who should not be judged by the unspiritual
4. Paul as a paradigm of faithful ἀγάπη.

Firstly, D. R. Hall rightly says that ‘the clearest indication of the continuity between chs. 1-4 and chs. 5-16 is the verb φυσιοῦται (to be puffed up).’³⁸ Considering γνῶσις in 8.1 and σοφία in ch. 1-3 not as separate types of knowledge which were sown by the same teachers in the Corinthian church, he suggests that the root of the divisions within the Corinthian church was the strong believers’ boasting based on γνῶσις. The Corinthian puffed-up people, or Christian sophists (esp. τινες in 4.18), would have taught and behaved in conflict with the wisdom taught by Paul.³⁹ In support of Hall, this thesis will argue that the fundamental problem of the Corinthian church was their lack of knowledge of God; this has led to the many problems of ‘divisions and jealousy’ (1.11; 3.3), ‘puffing up (4.6,18-19; 13.4) and boasting (1.29,31; 3.21; 4.7; 5.6; 13.3,4; cf. 9.15-16; 15.31),’ and ‘sin (6.18; 7.28,36; 8.12; 15.34,56) such as evil (5.8; 10.6; 13.5; 14.20; 15.33; cf. Rom 1.28-32) and wrongdoing (6.9; 13.6).’ The most serious problem was a little yeast of hostile puffing up and boasting leavening the whole church (5.6) causing them not to make faithful fellowship with believing friends (for a faithful fellowship see αἰρέσεις in 11.19 and μέρος in 12.27; 14.27,29 as opposed to discord between each other in 6.5). As such, they did not drive out evil-doers such as fornicators (5.1-13) and, furthermore, strong believers did not just alienate weak believers lacking γνῶσις in the church, but let them think of the food they eat as food offered to an idol (8.7) so that the church of God might be blamed (10.32; 11.22).

Secondly, ἀγάπη unites and builds up the church, while γνῶσις puffs up (8.1). ἀγάπη contradicts all the problems of the Corinthian church listed above (13.1-13). There were many members in the church, but divisions between members. Puffing

³⁸ Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, p. 32.

³⁹ Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, pp. 30-50.

up and boasting of γνῶσις not only divided the church (8.1,7), but put weak believers in danger of being destroyed (8.11).

On the contrary, altruistic love unites the church divided (κατηρτισμένοι in 1.10; also see Μεμέρισται ὁ χριστός in 1 Cor 1.13). ἀγάπη is not jealous or boastful or puffing up and thinks no evil (13.4-5). ἀγάπη seeks the other's advantage rather than his own advantage (10.24; 13.5), and does not make use of its right but bears all things for the other (στέγει in 9.12; 13.7). ἀγάπη is to believe the other (πιστεύει in 13.7) and weigh what they said in order that they are approved at the table of the Lord (11.19; cf. Rom 4.5) in keeping with a faithful God who invited a believer into the fellowship of Jesus Christ (1.9). ἀγάπη is to value the other's hope (9.10; 13.7). ἀγάπη is to endure weak fellow believers (ὑπομένει in 13.7; cf. 2 Tim 2.10).

In this way, in 1 Corinthians, ἀγάπη makes the divided church form one body (κατηρτισμένοι in 1 Cor 1.10; συνεκέρασεν τὸ σῶμα in 12.24). ἀγάπη is thus, the proper method of construction to build up God's building in Corinth (8.1). In the pictorial image of God's building (3.9), Christ is described as a foundation laid by St. Paul (θεμέλιον ἔθηκα in 3.10), just as members are described as a brick laid upon a foundation by God (ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο in 12.18). God's building is supposed to be built up through filling in a hole between bricks with ἀγάπη like a torn net is mended with a stitch (καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν in Matt 4.21; Mk 1.19). If someone else is building up with other materials, it will fall (3.10-15). ἀγάπη is lasting (13.13) so that the building built with ἀγάπη will never fall (Ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε πίπτει in 13.8).

Thirdly, the spiritual should not be judged by the unspiritual. With respect to B. A. Pearson's theory mentioned above, it is likely that the Apostle Paul's opponents were influenced by Philo so that their pneumatology showed an analogy with Philo's.⁴⁰ However, in Paul's pneumatology in 2.13b-16 (τὰ) πνευματικά is

⁴⁰ Refer to Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians*, pp. 38-39.

expressed as seeds sowed in God's field by St. Paul (9.11). In addition to that, τὰ πνευματικά τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ of 2.13-14 identified with τὰ χαρισθέντα (ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) of 2.12 is described as being revealed only by the Spirit of God, while prophetic pneumatology explained by Philo displays a strong inclination toward angelic-pneumatology (*Quaes Gen* 1.92; *Abr* 113).⁴¹ Accordingly, it is unlikely that 1 Cor 2.13b-16 reflects the expression of St. Paul's opponents, namely strong believers with a Philonic γνῶσις. Based on this finding, it will be argued that the Apostle Paul advocated that the spiritual should be judged by the fellow spiritual (2.13-16; 6.5; 11.18; 14.22,26-31), the unspiritual having not received the depths of God revealed only by the Spirit of God (2.10-12).

Lastly, along with the other scholars, Hall too as a result of excessive study centering on divisions within the Corinthian church did not find that Paul presented himself as a paradigm of faithful ἀγάπη to cure the problem. On the contrary this thesis will argue that Paul the Apostle introduces himself as a paradigm of faithful ἀγάπη. Faithfulness is explained in our epistle as seeking the profit of the many in accordance with ἀγάπη. Thus, St. Paul's purpose for writing 1 Corinthians was to remedy the problems by presenting himself as a paradigm of faithfulness (4.2; 7.7,8,25; cf. 4.17) and appealing to them to take their cue from him (4.6,16; 11.1). In this way the church will 'have been strengthened to the end' (1.8), so that the fruit of the mind will be increased in God's field with the superior seeds of the Spirit (2.13-14; 3.5-9; 9.11; 12.31; 14.1,12,14) and God's building will be built up with ἀγάπη (3.9-15; 8.1; 13; 14.1,3-5,12,17,26); also, the church of God will have been blameless on the day of Jesus Christ (1.8) and God's holy temple will be well preserved against sin (3.16-17; 5; 6.9-20; 7; 10.1-22; 11.27; 13.5-6; 14.20; 15.55-58).

⁴¹ For more information, refer to ch. 4.

2.2. A table of the structure of 1 Corinthians

Puffed-upness and boasting, and ἀγάπη and faithfulness

I. Introduction

- 1.1. Paul's address and greeting to the church of God in Corinth with grace and peace from God and the Lord (1.1-3) - A
- 1.2. Paul's thanksgiving to God for the Corinthian church and the faithfulness of God (1.4-9) - B

II. A remedy for divisions with partnership with and faithfulness toward fellow believers (1.10-4.21)

- 2.1. Divisions and boasting, weighing τὰ πνευματικά and teaching the body of the Lord (1.10-2.16)
 - 2.1.1. The problems of divisions and boasting and the message of the cross (1.10-31) - A
 - 2.1.2. People of the Spirit weigh τὰ πνευματικά and teach a member of the body of Christ with the mind of the Lord (2.1-16) - B
- 2.2. St. Paul as a paradigm of both partnership and faithfulness (3.1-4.21)
 - 2.2.1. Immaturity in a partnership for the church of God, and divisions and boasting (3.1-23) - A
 - 2.2.2. St. Paul as a paradigm of faithfulness (4.1-21) - B

III. Concerning fornication, immaturity in operating a tribunal of the church and unfaithfulness of the body to the Lord may incur judgment on the holy temple of God (5.1-7.40)

- 3.1. Puffed-upness and immaturity in the application of a tribunal of the church (5.1-6.11) - A
 - 3.1.1. Puffed-upness brings about hard-heartedness toward sincerity and truth at a tribunal of the church (5.1-13)
 - 3.1.2. Unfaithfulness between believers at a tribunal of the church (6.1-11)
- 3.2. Authority over the body (6.12-7.40) - B

- 3.2.1. The Lord has authority over the body (6.12-20)
- 3.2.2. St. Paul's opinion about marriage for faithfulness to the Lord (7.1-40)

IV. Concerning eating food sacrificed to idols, the contrast between puffed-upness by γνῶσις on behalf of oneself against another and self-control from ἀγάπη for the advantage of others (8.1-11.1)

- 4.1. Punishment for the puffed-upness of γνῶσις and a reward for self-control from ἀγάπη (8.1-9.27) - A**
 - 4.1.1. Admonition to strong believers for which γνῶσις without ἀγάπη may build up weak believers into eating food sacrificed to idols (8.1-13)
 - 4.1.2. Encouragement to strong believers to follow St. Paul's example and to endure and control oneself for the gospel (9.1-27)
- 4.2. Admonition to weak and strong believers for eating food sacrificed to idols (10.1-11.1) - B**
 - 4.2.1. Admonition to weak believers against becoming idolaters (10.1-22)
 - 4.2.2. Encouragement to strong believers to follow St. Paul's example and eat food without judging anything either in the meat market or an unbelieving friend's house for the profit of the many (10.23-11.1)

V. Faithful friendship for God's work (11.2-15.58)

- 5.1. Faithful friendship and building up God's building (11.2-13.13) - A**
 - 5.1.1. Humility and weighing what is said in faithful friendship for the sake of the body of Christ (11.2-34)
 - 5.1.1.1. Exhortation to women to lower themselves and to put a head-covering on their head (11.2-16)
 - 5.1.1.2. Necessity for faithful friendship at the Lord's Supper where what is said will be weighed for the sake of fellow weak believers (11.17-34)
 - 5.1.2. Building up of God's building (12.1-13.13)
 - 5.1.2.1. God builds up the body of Christ (12.1-31)
 - 5.1.2.2. ἀγάπη builds up God's never falling building (13.1-13)
- 5.2. Faithful friendship for building up God's building and cultivating**

God's field (14.1-15.58)

- B

5.2.1. The wise application of gifts for faithful friendship between believers (14.1-40)

5.2.2. Cultivation of never decaying fruit in God's field (15.1-58)

VI. Letter closing, with final instructions to devote themselves to the services of the saints and of the workers of the Lord through faithful fellowship and to subordinate themselves to the co-workers of the Lord and greet one another with a holy kiss in ἀγάπη (16.1-24)

6.1. Universal faithful fellowship through the workers of the Lord within the churches of God (16.1-12) - A

6.2. St. Paul's exhortation to the Corinthian church members to subordinate themselves to co-workers of the Lord and to greet one another with a holy kiss in ἀγάπη (6.13-24) - B

2.3. An explanation of the structure of 1 Corinthians

I. Introduction

The introduction has the following structure: A (greeting in 1.1-3) – B (thanksgiving and faithfulness in 1.4-9). Paul the Apostle sends greetings to the Corinthian church with grace and peace (1.1-3) and gives thanks to God for them, because not only has the grace of God strengthened the testimony of Christ among them but it will strengthen them to the end (1.4-8). God who called the Corinthian church members into the fellowship of His son Jesus Christ is introduced as faithful (1.9).

1.1. Paul's address and greeting to the church of God in Corinth with grace and peace (1.1-3)

The first section of the introduction (1.1-3) is the Apostle Paul and Sosthenes's benedictory greeting to the church of God in Corinth with grace and peace from God and Jesus Christ. This greeting is characterized with the name of 'the church of God' they gave to the Corinthian church. The expression occurs 6 times in genuine Pauline epistles and among those, 5 refer to the Corinthian church (1 Cor 1.2; 10.32; 11.22; 15.9; 2 Cor 1.1; Gal 1.13; cf. 1 Tim 3.15).

1.2. Paul's thanksgiving to God for the Corinthian church and the faithfulness of God (1.4-9)

Grace and peace in the greeting (1.3) brackets the second section (1.4-9). Grace is connected to strength through enriched gifts (1.4-8) and peace to faithfulness (1.9). The Greek χάρισμα is derived from the Greek χάρις. The Apostle gives thanks to God, since the Corinthians are not lacking in any gift of the Spirit and waiting for the disclosure of the Lord Jesus Christ. God who made the testimony of Christ be

strengthened with enriched gifts among them will strengthen them to the end in blamelessness on the day of the Lord Jesus Christ (1.6,8). And, the God of peace who called the Corinthians into the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ is identified as God of faithfulness (1.9; 7.15). Paul the Apostle reminds those who were called into the fellowship of His son Jesus Christ and called to be saints and call on the name of their Lord Jesus Christ that God is faithful (1.2,9; 4.2,17). No temptation has overtaken the Corinthian church believers but as such common to men (2.15; 10.13a). God is faithful, who will not permit them to be tested above what they are able to withstand and will with the temptation provide also the way out so that they may be able to endure it (10.13b).

Faithfulness as morality required of the workers of God becomes parallel to ἀγάπη in 1 Cor. Most commentators do not see the coherence of ἀγάπη and τὰ πνευματικά within our whole epistle so that they overlook not merely the importance of the ecclesiological images of God's field and God's building depicted in 3.14-15, but the parallelism between ἀγάπη and *faithfulness*. As God's co-workers (see esp. Θεοῦ ἔσμεν συνεργοί in 3.9 and all varieties of gifts, of services and of activities are included in πάντα ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ in 12.11), stewards of God's mysteries are required to use ἀγάπη in building up God's building and *faithfulness* in speaking God's wisdom hidden in mystery sown in God's field. The emphasis on the faithfulness of God in 1.9 turns out to be a message of hope to these vulnerable to temptation and an exhortation to the strong to be faithful to the weak.

Accordingly, in the introduction St. Paul greets the church of God in Corinth with strength through grace and faithfulness in peace. The Apostle Paul's pastoral wisdom to cure the church of God at Corinth was the faithfulness of God. This was the paradigm for the building/house of God so that it would be confirmed as blameless until the day of Jesus Christ.

II. A remedy for divisions with partnership with and faithfulness toward fellow believers (1.10-4.21)

The second part (1.10-4.21) has this structure: A (the problems of divisions and boasting, and the message of the cross in 1.10-31) – B (people of the Spirit weigh τὰ πνευματικά and teach the body of the Lord in 2.1-16) – A (Immaturity of the church of God, and divisions and boasting in 3.1-23) – B (the Apostle Paul as a paradigm of both partnership and faithfulness in 4.1-21).

2 A depicts the problems of divisions. The most serious problems caused by the absence of ἀγάπη are exposed as ‘puffing up and boasting’ which weakened fellowship within the assembly. In the absence of St. Paul and Apollos, the Corinthians have become wealthy and kings (4.8). Their puffing and boasting have brought about divisions and jealousy.

2 B explains how to solve the problems. They are encouraged to ‘make a model of St. Paul’ (4.6,16; 11.1; cf. 3.5-15) who is faithful to the church of God as a servant of Christ and a steward of God’s mysteries.

2.1. Divisions and boasting, and weighing τὰ πνευματικά and teaching the body of the Lord (1.10-2.16)

2.1.1. The problems of divisions and boasting, and the message of the cross (1.10-31)

The problem of the church was that 'the body of Christ' (10.16-17; 12.12-27; Rom 12.4-5) was split up (1.10,13; 3.3; 11.18; 12.25).⁴² They boasted themselves in human achievement, in the human condition (1.26,29; 3.21) such as liberty of γνῶσις (8.9; 10.29; cf. 9.15-16; 15.31). The Apostle pointed out serious problems such as *a little yeast of infectious boasting* by which all the parties of the Corinthian church were being leavened (5.6; also see. 1.29,31; 3.21; 4.7; 13.3,4) and *hostile puffing up* (4.6,18f.; 8.1f.) within the church. The more yeast of boasting leavening the whole church (5.6), the more puffed up they became and the more hostile they came to be toward each other (4.6-8).⁴³ As a result, the Corinthian church was divided.

On the contrary, Christ is an emblem of self-effacement. The message of the cross the Apostle Paul proclaimed at Corinth reflects His modesty (1.18-25). As opposed to hostile puffing up and boasting, as a faithful servant of Christ St. Paul himself present as a paradigm of modesty ('we are ... for the sake of Christ, but you are ... in Christ' in 4.10), in which St. Paul gives them a paradoxical exhortation that they should boast in the Lord (1.31; 9.15; 15.31; cf. 2 Cor 12.9-10).

2.1.2. People of the Spirit weigh τὰ πνευματικά and teach a member of the body of Christ with the mind of the Lord (2.1-16)

The Apostle contrasts the spiritual (people of the Spirit) with the unspiritual (the psychikos), and τὰ πνευματικά with words taught by human wisdom in ch. 2. The unspiritual with human wisdom are incapable of knowing God's mysteries but on the contrary the spiritual received τὰ πνευματικά and are capable of weighing it. The spiritual can judge all of τὰ πνευματικά but they are put on trial by no one (2.13-15). As explained above, 2.13b-16 does not reflect St. Paul's opponents' idea, but his guiding principle to secure weak believers from temptation they are unable

⁴² As for the source of a body metaphor, refer to E. Best, *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), pp. 83-114, 215-225.

⁴³ For more information, see. Ch. 7 (esp. 7.1.1. Problems within the Corinthian church).

to withstand caused by the severe judgments of strong believers or their wise unbelieving-friends (6.1f.; 11.22; 12.21; 14.23-25). The Apostle Paul posted an advertisement for a person of the Spirit with the mind of the Lord who can teach the wisdom that has been hidden, which God predestined before the ages for the glory of saints to a member of the body of Christ.

2.2. St. Paul as a paradigm of both partnership and faithfulness (3.1-4.21)

2.2.1. Immaturity in a partnership for the church of God, and divisions and boasting (3.1-23)

The beginning section of ch. 1 (1.10-13) is parallel to the beginning section of ch. 3 (3.1-4). The Corinthians had immature wisdom in forming one body. The Corinthian church is delineated as God's field (3.9). St. Paul presents a prime example of cooperation in himself and Apollos in a metaphor of God's field (3.4-9; 4.6). In addition to that, the Corinthians are described as God's building (3.9). The Apostle Paul as a skilled mater-builder laid a foundation of Christ. He addresses a question to them: 'how do you build up the body upon the foundation?' The question is answered with ἀγάπη within first Corinthians (8.1; 13; 14.1; 16.14,22,24). Christ humbled himself and became a foundation for God's building according to the grace and wisdom of God. On the contrary the Corinthian church members puffed up and boasted the human condition of wisdom, power and noble birth (1.26,29; 3.21; comp. 1.26 with 4.10), and they became kings (4.8). Their boasting brought about divisions within the church. On the contrary, ἀγάπη is not boastful (13.4) but builds up the church (8.1). The Apostle Paul urges paradoxically strong believers that they will be wise only if they become foolish for the sake of Christ; it will be worthy of boasting only if they boast about their weakness in the Lord (1.31; 15.31; 2 Cor 12.9) in order to form one body.

The absence of ἀγάπη is connected to the other subject of God's temple (3.16-17). If anyone corrupts the temple of God, God will destroy that person (15.33; also see 5.1-11.1). All these problems were caused by their puffing up and boasting. The ending section of ch. 1 (1.26-31) is repeated in the ending section of ch. 3 (3.18-23).

2.2.2. St. Paul as a paradigm of faithfulness (4.1-21)

In absence of the Apostle Paul and his brother Apollos from Corinth, Christian sophists and their pupils established their own kingdoms.⁴⁴ In addition, the most serious problem within the Corinthian church was their antagonistic arrogance. To remedy this problem, the Apostle Paul presents himself as a paradigm of faithfulness (4.2,6,16). Faithful stewards of God's house by no means not only judge anyone (4.3-5) but also do not puff up themselves against another (εἰς ὑπερ τοῦ ἐνὸς φουσιούσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἐτέρου in 4.6) or boast what they received in the grace of God (1.30-31). As God is faithful through believers, so also are His faithful workers to the body of Christ (1.9; 3.5-9; 4.1-2,16,17; 12.4-27). Puffed-upness (4.6) and boasting about human leaders (3.21) do nothing but divide the body. On the contrary, ἀγάπη builds up the body of Christ and faithfulness helps members to be able to endure a test (7.5; 10.13).

III. Concerning fornication, immaturity in operating a tribunal of the church and unfaithfulness of the body to the Lord incur judgment on the holy temple of God (5.1-7.40)

The assembly of saints (1.2. 6.1,2; 14.33; 16.1,15) is portrayed as the temple of God (3.16-17) and their body is depicted as a temple of the Holy Spirit (6.19). In the third part (5.1-7.40), St. Paul deals with problems such as fornication, puffing up, immaturity, and unfaithfulness which bring dishonour on the holy temple of God (ἅγιος in 1.30; 3.17; 6.11,19; 7.14,34).

The third part has the following structure: A (puffing up and immaturity in the application of a tribunal of the church in 5.1-6.11) – B (faithfulness to the Lord and to

⁴⁴ See. Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, pp. 30-32.

the body of the Lord in 6.12-7.40). A is divided into two: puffing up brings about apathy toward the purity of the body of Christ at a tribunal of the church (5.1-13) and puffing up brings about unfaithfulness between believers at a tribunal of the church (6.1-11). B is divided into two: faithfulness to the Lord (6.12-20) and faithfulness to the body of the Lord (7.1-40).

3.1. Puffed-upness up and immaturity in the application of a tribunal of the church (5.1-6.11)

A (5.1- 6.11) points out the Corinthians' immaturity at a tribunal of the church. In support of K. E. Bailey who argues that the motif of puffed-upness connects 4.17-21 and 5.1-11, D. R. Hall remarks that 'chapter 4 ends with a threat: some people are puffed up on the grounds that Paul is not coming to Corinth; but he will come, if the Lord wills, and will discover not the fine words of these puffed-up people but their power (4.18-19).'⁴⁵ He also says that 'this threat is immediately followed by a specific instance of Corinthian puffed-upness (5.1-2).'⁴⁶ Their puffed-upness led to apathy toward a problem of fornication (5.1-13) and unfaithfulness to fellow believers (6.1-11) so that not merely did they not drive out the wicked believer who deserved punishment, but dared to manipulate a tribunal of the church to let fellow believers be judged by unbelievers. As things turned out, their foolishness in purity and truth (εἰλικρινείας καὶ ἀληθείας in 5.8) brought blame upon the Corinthian church.

3.1.1. Puffed-upness brings about apathy toward the purity of the body of Christ at a tribunal of the church (5.1-13)

⁴⁵ Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, pp. 33-34.

⁴⁶ Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, pp. 33-34. Also refer to K. E. Bailey, 'The Structure of 1 Corinthians and Paul's Theological Method with Special Reference to 4.17,' *NovT* 25 (1983), pp. 152-181 (160-163).

Most scholars have not considered the possibility that the Corinthian church had a tribunal. As for the meaning of κριτηρίων or κριτήρια, W. Schenk affirms that ‘one does not need to consider the formal meaning “insignificant courts” or “those [courts] that have jurisdiction over the petty details of everyday life.”’⁴⁷ BAGD translates vv. 2,4 as follows (ἀνάξιοί ἐστε κριτηρίων ἐλαχίστων; ‘are you unfit to form even the most insignificant courts [i.e., those that have jurisdiction over the petty details of everyday life]?’ in 6.2; βιωτικὰ μὲν οὖν κριτήρια ἐὰν ἔχητε, τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τούτους καθίζετε; ‘if you have [need for] courts for the matters of everyday life, do you appoint insignificant men [as judges]?’ in 6.4).⁴⁸ In support of Rosner who understands 6.2 as Paul’s urge for the Corinthians to have a tribunal for small claims themselves, Thiselton comprehends 6.4 as an interrogative interpretation.⁴⁹ However, according to Garland, ‘Lightfoot claims that it is awkward to have an interrogative at the end of a long sentence, and it obscures the force of μὲν οὖν (nay rather) at the beginning of the clause.’⁵⁰ Garland understand 6.2 as Paul’s question whether the Corinthians “are incompetent to judge the most insignificant cases”⁵¹ but explains 6.4 as an imperative, interpreting ἐξουθενημένους as fellow Christians despised in the church, because ‘the church had only the power to appoint fellow Christians.’⁵²

Also, according to Garland, ‘the infinitive κρίνεσθαι of 6.1 has the meaning of going to law (cf. Matt 5.40).’⁵³ Thiselton says that ‘it is safe to conclude that the use of Roman provincial courts for minor cases and the near certainty of a result of questionable justice are virtually synonymous.’⁵⁴ On the contrary Garland emphasizes that, in the time of the Apostle Paul, Jews’ prevailing attitude was

⁴⁷ W. Schenk, ‘κριτήριον’ in *EDNT* 2 (H. Balz and G. Schneider eds) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1991), p. 321.

⁴⁸ BAGD, p. 453.

⁴⁹ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 428-433.

⁵⁰ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, p. 205.

⁵¹ See. J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. 9th edition (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht,1910), p. 147.

⁵² Garland, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 203-207.

⁵³ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, p. 195.

⁵⁴ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 424.

unwillingness to resort to heathen courts.⁵⁵ Furthermore, in 1 Cor, as for the identity of unbelievers it has a tendency of a priority of a Jew over a Gentile.⁵⁶ If the Greek ἐξουθενημένους of 6.4 can be interpreted as outsiders such as catechumens, it would reflect the situation of 14.23-25 that believers were judged by outsiders. In this regard, we can assume that the Corinthian church had a tribunal for small affairs, although some Corinthians may have resorted to Roman courts from habit.

Consequently, it is likely that the Corinthian church had a small-temporary tribunal by which they may have had authority to judge fellow Christians doing evil. However, they were puffed up and became apathetic toward wisdom of Christ from God, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption (1.30; 6.11); they became foolish regarding how to operate the tribunal. M. R. Malcolm presents Philo, *Spec Leg* 1.293 ('Yeast is forbidden because of the rising that comes from it. Again this can be taken symbolically: That no one, approaching the altar, should be raised up or puffed up with arrogance.'⁵⁷) as the background of St. Paul's direct linking of 'puffing up' and 'yeast' in 1 Cor 5.6-8. If this is the correct understanding, it is likely that the more the yeast of boasting leavened the whole batch of dough, the more unresponsive they became to the unleavened bread of purity and truth and the more the yeast of γνῶσις corrupted the temple of God (3.17; 5.6-8; 8.1,11).

3.1.2. Puffed-upness brings about unfaithfulness between believers at a tribunal of the church (6.1-11)

As explained before the Corinthians became puffed up against one another (4.6). In here, the usual scholarly view is that Paul is talking about Christians using secular law-courts.⁵⁸ However, if the Corinthian church had a strong inclination to display

⁵⁵ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, p. 201.

⁵⁶ For more information, see. Ch. 6.1.

⁵⁷ This translation is of M. R. Malcolm's book, *The World of 1 Corinthians: An Exegetical Source Book of Literary and Visual Backgrounds* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2012), p 64.

⁵⁸ Refer to Thiselton, *The first Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 424, n. 14. Also see. P. Garnsey, 'The Civil Suit,' in *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon

restraint in resorting to heathen courts, it is likely that they had a small internal tribunal, but no wise fellow believer who could weigh what was said for the sake of them. In that case, when they had a case between believers, they dared to present a case for themselves with the help of unbelievers rather than with that of believers. This assumption supports reading 14.20-25 in regular order within the coherent structure of 14.20-38, which leads to another interpretation of 14.23-25 that believers wanted unbelievers to judge religious matters in relation to speaking in tongues and prophecy. They called the unrighteous as witnesses, brought a complaint against each other before their unbelieving friends and did not stop accusing their fellow believers until the other believer turned out to be guilty (6.7). In this way, the temple of God has been blamed. For the sake of God's temple, St. Paul reminded the Corinthian church of the importance of Christian fellowship (6.7-8; cf. 1.8; also see. φιλήματι ἀγίῳ and φιλεῖ in 16.19-22).

3.2. Faithfulness to the Lord and to the body of the Lord (6.12-7.40)

B (6.12-7.40) emphasizes the authority of the Lord over the body. St. Paul as a faithful steward of God's mysteries, like the mystery of the resurrection, that God raised the Lord and will also raise us by His power (4.1-2; 6.14; 15.51), encouraged them to be faithful to the Lord not merely by being holy in the body (6.19; 7.14,34) so that they would not be mastered by anything or anyone only except the Lord (6.12) but by remaining in the situation in which he or she was when God called them so that they are required to be faithful to the Lord (7.32,34) and to the body of the Lord (cf. 5.1; 7.1f.,8-11).

Press, 1970); J. M. Kelly, *Roman Litigation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966); W. Kunkel, *An Introduction to Roman Legal and Constitutional History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2d ed. 1973); A. H. M. Jones, *The Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1972); J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1984); and K. H. Ziegler, *Das private Schiedsgericht im antiken römischen Recht* (Munich: Beck, 1971).

3.2.1. Faithfulness to the Lord (6.12-20)

D. R. Hall explains that the expression Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν (all things are allowable to me) was ‘probably the widespread philosophical idea that the wise man will always make wise decisions and therefore has the right to do whatever he wishes’ (Dio Chrsostom, *Or.* 14.16 and Philo, *Quod Omn* 59).⁵⁹ If this is the correct way of comprehending it, 1 Cor 6.12-20 would be Paul’s teaching to cure the new wisdom (‘every sin that is committed is external to the body’) toward the body and sin taught by the teachers at Corinth.

According to Paul the Apostle, authority over the body belongs to no one else than the Lord, since it was purchased at a price by the Lord. Faithfulness between the body and the Lord should be preserved against fornication. The body is meant for the Lord and the Lord for the body. Their body is the temple of the Holy Spirit so that they should fulfill an obligation to glorify God in their body.

3.2.2. Faithfulness to the body of the Lord (7.1-40).

Ch. 7 reflects on St. Paul’s response to the letter sent to him by the Corinthians. He emphatically argued that none other but the Lord had authority over the body in 6.12-20. In ch. 7, he consistently reasoned them into compliance in commanding and suggesting tones in order that each person conducts his or her life as the Lord has apportioned it and God has called each (7.8,17,20,24,26,40) so the temple of God may not be accused of fornication. As a result, the unmarried and virgins can be faithful to the Lord, as others are faithful to the body of the Lord through keeping their present marriage status. However, remarriage is allowed in order that the Corinthians may avoid sexual immorality.

⁵⁹ Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, p. 37.

More to the point, believers are required to exercise self-control and to use the freedom given not only to keep faithfulness to the Lord and to the body of the Lord, but to show God's faithfulness to unbelievers. In this way, the church of God will be strengthened until the day of Jesus Christ.

IV. Concerning eating food sacrificed to idols, the contrast between puffed-upness by γνῶσις on behalf of oneself against another and self-control from ἀγάπη for the advantage of others (8.1-11.1)

The fourth part has structure: A (punishment for puffed-upness by γνῶσις and a reward for self-control from ἀγάπη in 8.1-9.27) and B (admonition to weak and strong believers for eating food sacrificed to idols in 10.1-11.1).

A is divided into two: 'admonition to strong believers for which the immature-omnipotent γνῶσις may build up weak believers into eating food sacrificed to idols' (8.1-13) and 'encouragement to strong believers to follow St. Paul's example and relinquish "rights" for weak believers' advantage (9.1-27).' B is divided into two: 'admonition to weak believers for going beyond what is written' (10.1-22) and 'encouragement to strong believers to follow St. Paul's example and eat it without judging anything either in the meat market or an unbelieving friend's house for the advantage of many' (10.23-11.1).

8.1-3 outlines the entire part (8.1-11.1). ἀγάπη is not puffed up (13.4) but builds up God's building (8.1). In the section 8.1-11.1, ἀγάπη is expressed as 'endurance and self-control' in 9.1-27 (esp. στέγω in 9.12 and 13.7); it is defined as 'what does not seek his own advantage' in 10.23-11.1 (esp. μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἑμαυτοῦ σύμφορον in 10.33 and οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς in 13.5). What is required of strong believers with γνῶσις is

endurance and what does not seek their own advantage for the profit of the many (8.1-9.27; 10.23-11.1), while what weak believers without γνῶσις should be aware of is that if they eat food sacrificed to idols, they may fall over a stumbling stone caused by strong believers' rights (8.2; 10.1; also see 8.9; 10.12). Anyone who loves God is known by Him and will receive a reward (8.3; 9.17,24; cf. Heb 11.6). On the contrary, there will be punishment on those who are puffed up on behalf of themselves against another, who do not endure, who seek their own advantage in opposition to ἀγάπη (8.1,3;12; 9.16,27; 10.29) and those who do not know what they should know (8.2; 10.1-22).

4.1. Punishment for the puffed-upness of γνῶσις and a reward for self-control from ἀγάπη (8.1-9.27)

In A (8.1-9.27), St. Paul contrasts puffed-upness by γνῶσις and self-control from ἀγάπη. γνῶσις puffs up on behalf of oneself against another, whilst ἀγάπη without the yeast of puffing up builds up God's building (8.1. cf. 5.2,6; 13.4). Wise men who know ἀγάπη endure everything for weak believers' profit and the gospel of Christ (8.1-3,13; 9.12; 13.7), whilst γνῶσις without self-control may become a stumbling block to the weak (8.9f.). St. Paul encourages those whom have rights which come from γνῶσις to exercise self-control and win a prize (9.17,24-25), and if not, they will be punished (9.16,27; 10.29; cf. 14.38).

4.1.1. Admonition to strong believers for which γνῶσις without ἀγάπη may build up weak believers into eating food sacrificed to idols (8.1-13)

With respect to food sacrificed to idols, those who know ἀγάπη are known by God, whilst believers puffed up with γνῶσις are described as foolish and will not be recognized by Him (8.1-3). γνῶσις is one of the gifts of the Spirit (12.8) but it is given to only a small number of members so that it granted rights only to strong believers so a church hierarchy might have been formed (12.7-9). In ch. 8, the Apostle Paul

points out a serious problem- strong believers used the gift in a way that might become a stumbling stone to weak believers and bring about the destruction of fellow brothers (8.9-11). In this regard, the Apostle Paul emphasizes the self-control of ἀγάπη against an abuse of their rights (8.12-13).

4.1.2. Encouragement to strong believers to follow St. Paul's example and to endure and control oneself for the gospel (9.1-27)

The Apostle Paul had the rights of Apostle such as the right to eat and drink, the right to be accompanied by a believing wife and the right to stop working for a living (9.1-6). It is likely that human authority is parallel to the law here (9.8). The rights Apostles have received are based on the law. Apostles are depicted as God's soldiers, farmers in God's vineyard and field, shepherds and temple workers (9.7,10,11,13) and the law secures the hope of God's workers for a wage (9.9,13-14; also see a linguistic coherence between 'hope' of 9.10 and that of 13.13). In 9.10, the Apostle Paul and his brother Sosthenes are depicted as workers who have sown τὰ πνευματικά (the seeds of the Spirit) in God's field. However, as Paul and Sosthenes proclaimed the gospel, according to endurance from ἀγάπη (9.12; 13.7), they not only have not made use of the right to reap material benefits from them in order not to put an obstacle in the way of the gospel of Christ (9.12) but have become all things to all people in order to save some (9.22). There will be a reward for those who do this entirely by personal choice (9.17,24) and the law guarantees a wage even for those who proclaim the gospel making full use of their rights (9.4-10). Furthermore, there will be punishment to those who do not exercise self-control and proclaim the gospel (9.12-16); those who look like athletes unprepared for the race or boxers aimlessly beating the air. St. Paul exhorts the Corinthians with the rights to exercise self-control and win a prize as he does. No matter how much the law secures hope for the rights, if workers puff up on behalf of oneself against another so that they do not endure their rights for the advantage of others (9.12) and control oneself for faithfulness to the gospel (1.9; 4.1-2), they will be revealed as unfaithful which will become a stumbling block to the weak (8.9; 9.12; cf. Rom 5.5; 9.33; 10.11) and good for nothing in the way of the gospel (9.24-26), and accordingly, they will be disqualified (9.27; cf 8.1-3).

4.2. Admonition to weak and strong believers for eating food sacrificed to idols (10.1-11.1)

4.2.1. Admonition to weak believers against becoming idolaters (10.1-22)

According to D. R. Hall, with reference to one of many theories as to the partition of 1 Corinthians it has been argued that there occurs 'the alleged inconsistency between 8.1-13 and 10.1-22' so that they must be included in different letters.⁶⁰ In respect to this problem, Thiselton suggests two different scenarios that 10.1-22 may present "'a worst case" scenario found perhaps in a minority group of extremists among the strong' who were very aggressive in not only eating meat in the pagan temple precincts but participation in idolatrous cultic events.⁶¹ Refuting his argument, D. R. Hall supposes the same scenario for the two, because as to 10.21 'the eating of meals was a major factor in the background to ch. 10, as it is in 8.10.'⁶²

However, in opposition to their understanding of 10.1-22 as an admonition delineated on the basis of the strong ones' position, I suggest this text as an admonition to the weak. In ch. 8, surely the Apostle Paul admonishes strong believers that they should use their rights so as not to build up weak believers without γνῶσις toward eating food sacrificed to idols. In 10.1-22, however, the object of his admonition has changed from the strong to the weak. He warns weak believers against becoming idolaters. The reason that 10.1-22 addresses the admonition given to weak believers is as follows. Firstly, strong believers have γνῶσις that 'no idol in the world really exists and there is no other God but one' (8.4) so that the teaching of self-control would be more suitable for them rather than the admonition of eating food sacrificed to idols. Secondly, Ὡστε ὁ δοκῶν ἐστάναι βλεπέτω μὴ πέσῃ (so if you think you are standing, watch out lest you fall) in 10.12 reflects πρόσκομμα (a cause of stumbling) in 8.9. In addition, ἀπόλλυται in 8.11 is connected to κατεστρώθησαν in 10.5 and ἀπώλλυντο and ἀπώλοντο in 10.9-10.

⁶⁰ Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, pp .41-50.

⁶¹ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 718.

⁶² Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, p. 46.

Accordingly, what weak believers should have known (10.1; cf. 8.2) is that even though they ate 'the food of the Spirit' (πνευματικὸν βρῶμα) and drank 'the drink of the Spirit' (πνευματικὸν πόμα), whoever did evil would be destroyed (10.1-6). Evil (κακός in 10.6) is explained as idolatry, sexual immorality, putting Christ to the test and muttering with complaints (10.7-10). Among them, the problem of idolatry is dealt with in 10.14-22. If weak believers with no γνῶσις eat food sacrificed to idols following strong believers with γνῶσις, they may fall. Consequently, the Apostle Paul exhorts them not to partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons.

- 4.2.2. Encouragement to strong believers to follow St. Paul's example and to eat food without judging anything either in the meat market or an unbelieving friend's house for the profit of the many (10.23-11.1)

The expression 'ἀγάπη builds up' is connected to this section (10.23-11.1). ἀγάπη does not seek its own advantage (10.23-24,33; 13.5). The most significant subject in this epistle, "faithfulness" (1.9) is explained in this section (10.23-11.1) as seeking the profit of the many in accordance with ἀγάπη. Believers who have been called into the fellowship of Jesus Christ are required to be faithful to everyone and seek the profit of the many as Christ does (1.9; 4.1-2; 11.1). This section is teaching given to those who have liberty gained by rights they have (ἡ ἐλευθερία μου in 10.29; also see 8.9) to those whom the ethics of love are required. The Apostle Paul exhorts them to take care of others' conscience and not to hurt it (8.12; 10.28-29) by eating food without judging anything either in the meat market or an unbelieving friend's house. Otherwise, they might be judged due to rights and liberty they have (10.29). St. Paul encourages them to follow his example the same as he imitates the virtues of Christ who seeks the advantage of the many in faithfulness of ἀγάπη (11.1).

V. Faithful friendship for God's work (11.2-15.58)

The fifth part has this structure: A (faithful friendship and building up God's building in 11.2-13.13) – B (faithful friendship for building up God's building and cultivating God's field in 14.1-15.58).

A is divided into two: humility and weighing what is said in faithful friendship (11.2-34) and building up of God's building (12.1-13.13). Faithful friendship builds up God's building. B is divided into two: the wise application of gifts and faithful friendship (14.1-40) and cultivation of never decaying fruit in God's field (15.1-58). Faithful fellowship weighs what is said (interpretation and weighing what is prophesied). Faithful workers witness the resurrection of Christ and cultivate never decaying fruits in God's field.

As mentioned before, divisions within the church caused by hostile puffing up were the most serious problems (1.11; 3.3; 11.18). The problem was by no means irrelevant to women prophets' puffing up (14.36). *γνώσις* puffs up (8.1) and women prophets were puffed up (14.36). They were apt to go beyond what is written (*ἅ γέγραπται* in 4.6). There are diversities of scholarly opinions as to the interpretation of the phrase 'what is written.' According to Thiselton, among seven possible explanations of the expression, Calvin and Cramner believe that 'the phrase means what is written in this epistle.'⁶³ If this is the correct understanding, it will indicate St. Paul's saying in 1.31 that 'as it is written, "Let the one who boasts, boast in the Lord"' (also see Jer 9.23f.). They boasted high-level knowledge of *γνώσις* that weak believers did not have and were puffed up (1.26-31; 3.21; 4.6; 5.6; 8.1,7,11). Because of that, St. Paul commands them to become subject to fellow believers (14.32). It is likely that *γνώσις* and prophecy belong to *τὰ πνευματικά*. St. Paul shared with the Corinthians and furthermore, their prophesying was enhanced by *γνώσις* (13.2; 14.6). However, the problem was that the specialized *γνώσις* led to prophetesses boasting and being puffed up and it brought about divisions. In this regard, in the very first section

⁶³ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 352.

(11.2-16), the Apostle Paul dealt with the problem. He exhorts them to humble themselves and submit to their believing husbands (11.3f.; 14.34-35).

γνώσις makes them puffed up on behalf of themselves against another and divided (11.18), while ἀγάπη forms faithful friendship (πάντα πιστεύει, 'ἀγάπη trusts all things' in 13.7). Believers can be approved to be righteous in the faithful partnership or the faithful friendship (see. αἰρέσεις of 11.19) when with the ethics of ἀγάπη believers build up God's building and weigh what is prophesied for the sake fellow believers in faithful friendship (14.22,29). God's faithful workers like He is build up His never falling building and cultivate never decaying fruit in His field.

5.1. Faithful friendship and building up God's building (11.2-13.13)

5.1.1. Humility and weighing what is said in faithful friendship for the sake of the body of Christ (11.2-34)

5.1.1.1. Exhortation to women to lower themselves and to put a head-covering on their head (11.2-16)

According to D. G. Horrell, scholarly opinions on the interpretation of κεφαλή are divided into two: 'source' or 'authority over' and he points out that 'recent work has cast doubt on the appropriateness of "source" as a translation of κεφαλή.'⁶⁴ Scholarly tendency to interpret κεφαλή in the context of hierarchy is based on the presupposition that woman's place was inferior to man's in the Corinthian church. Horrell thinks that Paul the Apostle's ultimate aim was undoubtedly equality between genders and considers 11.3 as the Corinthian theological idea. According to this narrative, St. Paul endeavored to give honour to the inferior Corinthian women in order to guarantee their dignity to some extent and thus, Horrell interprets the phrase ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς in 11.10 as the woman's own possession of authority.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthians Correspondence*, p. 171. Also see Perriman, pp. 610-617; also n. 232 below.

⁶⁵ Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthians Correspondence*, pp. 170-173.

On the contrary, the reading of 11.3 as the Corinthian theological idea is opposed by Garland. Based on Conzelmann's argument,⁶⁶ he stresses that Paul is suggesting to them "a new insight" in 11.3.⁶⁷ In support of Perriman, whose conclusion is that Paul wanted to correct the Corinthian women's refusal to wear the usual head covering,⁶⁸ he suggests translating 11.10 as 'the woman ought to have authority over her head (Delobel 1986, p. 387; Padgett 1984, pp. 71-72; Schrage, 1995, p. 514; Cf. B. Hall 1990; Thiselton 2000, p. 840).'⁶⁹ But, this reading has a tendency to place the Corinthian women in a very subordinate position to men.

However, I suggest an alternative interpretation that describes the Corinthian women as the strong puffed up ones. St. Paul says that God chose the weak in the world to shame (καταισχύνη) the strong (1.27), because the strong of high economic level humiliated the weak (μη γὰρ οἰκίας οὐκ ἔχετε εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν; ... καὶ καταισχύνετε τοὺς μη ἔχοντας; in 11.22). Women prophets' puffedness up is exposed in 14.36 and, due to that, Paul the Apostle does not allow them to speak in the church. That they refuse Paul's command will cause their shame (αἰσχρὸν in 14.35). With respect to women's head-covering, Paul identifies the order of creation with the order of the church and places women secondary to men (11.3; also see. 3.22; 12.13; 14.34-36). Moreover, he commands women to put on a head-covering (11.5,13) and imposes sanctions on their prophecy (14.32). Through the entire epistle of 1 Corinthians, women have been consistently depicted as those who were supposed to concede authority to husbands (7.4; 11.3f.; 14.34-35; also comp. 12.13 to Gal 3.28). If they refuse the church order commanded by the Apostle Paul, they will not escape the shame of having their hair cut off or shaven (refer to 'Make yourselves bald [ξύρησαι] and cut off [κεῖραι] your hair for your pampered children' in Mic 1.16 NRSV contrary to 2 Sam 14.25).

⁶⁶ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, p. 183.

⁶⁷ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, p. 513.

⁶⁸ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, p. 506.

⁶⁹ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 511,525.

If this is the correct understanding, women's head-covering should be interpreted as St. Paul trying to restrain their behaviour. He urges women prophets on to humble themselves on account of angelic or human mediators as well as for the sake of their husbands in the public worship (γυνὴ διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα of 1 Cor 11.9 and ἡ γυνὴ...διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους of 11.10).

5.1.1.2. Necessity for faithful friendship at the Lord's Supper in which what is said will be weighed for the sake of fellow weak believers (11.17-34)

The Apostle Paul brings up the problem of divisions at the table of the Lord again in which the "have-nots" would have had to feel that they were left out of the group. D. E. Garland explains that 'the problem is simply this: when they eat the Lord's Supper, they divide along socioeconomic lines. Each one eats his or her own supper and those who have plenty ignore those who little or nothing. ... Social questions clearly dominate the beginning (11.17-22) and the ending (11.27-34) of this section.'⁷⁰ In accordance with that, his pastoral wisdom is to form faithful friendship (δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἰρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι 'Indeed, there have to be faithful friendships among you' in 11.19) in which (weak) believers' righteousness will be approved. Anyone who is about to participate in the table of the Lord should approve his or her righteousness in the faithful friendship (see linguistic coherency between δόκιμοι in 11.19 and δοκιμαζέτω in 11.28). They could make faithful friendship when they weigh what is said for the sake of a fellow believer (6.5; 11.29; 14.29). Weighing what is said (διακρίνω) makes all tongues and lips in agreement (1.10; also see. φιλήματι ἀγίω in 16.20). On the other hand, in the situation of divisions, if anyone does not weigh what is said for sake of fellow believers and eats and drinks at the table of the Lord, he or she will be judged, because his or her heartlessness leaves fellow believers alone and lets them be judged (8.9-12; 11.29-34; 16.22). In other words, even if prophets are highly esteemed (12.28-29), they will be cursed, if they do not make friends with the despised (11.22; cf. 1.28) and do not weigh what the despised said

⁷⁰ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, p. 533.

(11.29). On the contrary, there will be a blessing to those who wait for one another to build up by weighing what his or her fellow believer will say (11.33; 14.26-31).

5.1.2. Building up of God's building (12.1-13.13)

5.1.2.1. God builds up the body on Christ (12.1-31)

12.1-3 has the following structure: A (v.1) – B (v.2) – C (v.3) and, as such, A and C enclose B. The Corinthians remember that they themselves used to be carried away to τὰ εἶδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα (the Greek τὰ ἄφωνα can be interpreted as either “incapable of speech”⁷¹ or “mute”⁷²), when they were pagans (12.2). However, St. Paul explains what he wants them to know in A and C (vv. 1,3). They need to clear away misunderstanding on some gifts which look inferior (12.3; also see. οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος in vv. 15-16, χρεῖαν σου οὐκ ἔχω, … χρεῖαν ὑμῶν οὐκ ἔχω in v. 21). All the varieties of gifts are practiced by the same Holy Spirit (12.4,9) the same as each member of the body of Christ is a temple of the Holy Spirit, no matter how inferior he or she may be. The Greek τῶν πνευματικῶν of 12.1 has linguistic coherency with trio of 12.4-6 (χαρισμάτων, διακονιῶν, ἐνεργημάτων) which emphasize diversity. Consequently, assuming that τῶν πνευματικῶν of 12.1 is identified with χαρισμάτων of 12.4, it is likely that ch. 12 would be St. Paul's remedy for divisions within the Corinthian church in which there would have been divergent understanding on varieties of gifts.

According to St. Paul's description, the Holy Spirit, the Lord and God are described as working together. The Lord subdivides up “services” (διακονιῶν of 12.5) into many in His body (ἔκλασεν in 11.24; διατρέσεις in 12.5), the Spirit divides up gifts and allots to each one individually (διατρέσεις in 12.4; διαιοῦν in 12.11), and God places each member in order (12.28). The dividing is for the profit of each member (12.7; also refer to. αἰρέσεις in 11.19). In spite of varieties of gifts, however, the Spirit

⁷¹ Thiselton renders it into “incapable of speech.” *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 907,911-916.

⁷² MIT translates it as “mute.”

is same (12.4,9,11,13). Even though Christ is variously described as a foundation for God's building (3.11), the rock of the Spirit of which water flows out, and a loaf of a bread at the table of the Lord (11.23f.) and furthermore, the service of the Lord is diverse (διάκονοι in 3.5; διακονιῶν in 12.5; διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις in 16.15), the Lord is one (8.6). Christ is identified with the Lord in 1 Cor (1.2,3,7,9,10; 2.8; 4.5; 5.4,5; 6.11,14,17; 8.6; 10.21,22; 11.11,27; 12.3,5; 15.57; 16.23; and so on). God is one (12.6; cf. 8.6), although the work of God (ἐνεργημάτων in 12.6; also see θεοῦ συνεργοί in 3.9) looks as if divided into God's field and God's building (3.9).

The Three (God, the Lord and the Spirit) work in close cooperation. Servants of the Lord (διάκονοι in 3.5; διακονιῶν in 12.5) are identified with God's workers (θεοῦ συνεργοί in 3.9; ἐνεργημάτων in 12.6). The Spirit teaches the things that were freely given to believers by God (τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα in 2.12); the things that are identified with τὰ πνευματικά (2.12-14). In this regard, it might be supposed that τῶν πνευματικῶν of 12.1 is identified with χαρισμάτων of 12.4. Furthermore, 'a person of the Spirit' (sing. πνευματικός in 2.15; 14.37) or 'people of the Spirit' (pl. πνευματικοῖς in 2.13) are supposed to work with 'God's workers' (θεοῦ συνεργοί) in building up God's building with 'the gifts of the Spirit' (τῶν πνευματικῶν of 12.1 or χαρισμάτων of 12.4) (14.3,5,12,26). The Three work together also for the unification of the body. The Spirit and Christ will baptize many people into one body (12.13), who drink the same drink of the Spirit from the rock of the Spirit, Christ (12.4). God place the members divided into the body as he chose (12.18).

However, in 12.12-31, the Apostle Paul portrays Christ as the body and the body brings up the image of the one bread (10.17). 12.12 narrates the division of one body into many which is linked to 12.14-17 and forming one body which is linked to 12.18-31. In 12.13 as well, St. Paul emphasizes unifying of members into one body in the Spirit; the Spirit is depicted as the drink from the rock which makes all unified into one body (10.4). In 12.14-17, the Apostle Paul stresses that their being broken into pieces is from the one bread (esp. see ἐκ τοῦ σώματος in 12.15-16; also refer to ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος in Rom 9.21). Consequently, the Corinthian church, who had knowledge only from a part, should have known the varieties they had were of the

same origin- Christ. If they see each member not from the body, but only from a part (12.15-16), the building they built up will fall (13.9-10).

Surely the Apostle Paul emphasizes, in 12.18-31, the importance of forming one body. The body of Christ as one unit is composed of many parts (μέλη ἐκ μέρους in 12.27) and each part is composed of many members (μέλη in 12.18-20,27). In 1 Cor., God's work (ἔργος τοῦ θεοῦ) is ultimately depicted as building up God's building (3.9,13-15; 12.6). St. Paul introduces himself as 'a skilled master-builder' (σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων in 3.10). He explains God's work as building up God's building upon a foundation in 3.9-15 (refer to the word ἐποικοδομεῖ) and as placing each brick to build up into one unit in 12.18-31 (ἔθηκα). The word ἔθετο of 12.18,23,28 (cf. Rom 9.33), echoes ἔθηκα of 3.10 in which God and His workers work together. In the same way, God places each member in the one body according to the order he chose (12.18,28) and His workers clothe those members of the body we consider as despised with great honour (see. περιτίθεμεν in 12.23 and συνεκέρασεν τὸ σῶμα in 12.24). In this regard, God blended the body, giving greater honour to the inferior member (12.24).

In 12.12-27, divisions are described as the real problem of the Corinthian church. St. Paul's pastoral wisdom is making them realize that all the various members are from the body of Christ and each member should be able to belong to a part in faithful friendship (μέλη ἐκ μέρους in 11.19) in which their righteousness will be approved (also see. 11.19; 14.27).

12.28-31 is structured: A (v. 28) – B (vv. 29-30) – C (v. 31). In A, the Apostle Paul enumerates God's workers in order. B raises a question of the Corinthian church's tendency toward uniformity. In C, St. Paul stresses that diversification toward superiority in applying gifts should be encouraged in 12.31a, while uniformity in applying gifts caused by the strong ones' contempt for the weak should be restrained in 12.31b (see. 12.17-19,29-30; 14.23-25). The phrase ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα in 14.31a is connected to the expression ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά in 14.1a which draws the first part of ch.14 (14.1b-19). Here, it is

emphasized that intelligible gifts are greater than unintelligible gifts, in order that the church may be not lacking in any gift, so that the testimony of Christ will be strengthened among them and they will be strengthened as blameless until the day of Jesus Christ (see. 1.4-8). The expression Καὶ ἔτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι ('and again, according to superiority, I will show you a way') in 13.31b is re-explained as ἀγάπη in ch. 13. ἀγάπη is greater than all the other things (gifts, services and activities of 12.4-6) in building up God's building. A way according to superiority of 12.31b is depicted as opposed to uniformity of 12.29-30. The expression καθ' ὑπερβολὴν (according to superiority) of 12.31b is connected to κατὰ δύο ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τρεῖς καὶ ἀνὰ μέρος in 14.27 (and also see Προφητῆται δὲ δύο ἢ τρεῖς λαλεῖτωσαν in 14.29 and καθ' ἓνα πάντες προφητεύειν in 14.31), which is opposed to *all speak in tongues* of 14.23 and *all prophesy* of 14.24.

5.1.2.2. ἀγάπη builds up God's never falling building (13.1-13)

In ch. 13, there is a marked contrast between what is partial (ἐκ μέρους in 12.9f.) and what is perfect (τὸ τέλειον in 12.10). When what is perfect will come, speaking in tongues will cease, and γνῶσις and prophecy which are also partial (ἐκ μέρους in 13.9; also see. 12.27) will 'come to an end' (καταργηθήσεται in 13.8,10; also see 1.28; 2.6; 8.8) (13.8-10). Then, God will, with perfect wisdom in Christ, choose what is weak in the world and bring to nought and shame the strong who are from a part (1.27-28; also see. 14.20-38).

ἀγάπη is described as perfect in wisdom in Christ (13.10; 14.20; also see 4.10). According to 8.1 (also see. 14.1,3-5,12,17,26), ἀγάπη builds up God's building (also refer to ἐποικοδομέω in 3.10-14) and the Greek πίπτει of 13.8 (cf. Lk 11.17) should be rendered "fall" as opposed to οἰκοδομεῖ of 8.1. In this regard, ἀγάπη is given as a solution to πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ (3.10) and a way of building up God's building in 12.31. ἀγάπη is depicted as a method of construction by God's wisdom. Consequently, ἀγάπη builds up God's building permanently, since ἀγάπη never causes things to fall.

5.2. Faithful friendship for building up God's building and cultivating God's field (14.1-15.58)

5.2.1. The wise application of gifts for faithful friendship between believers (14.1-40)

In 14.1a, the expression Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην frames the entire chapter. The reason that St. Paul chose the expression τὰ πνευματικά in 14.1a rather than τὰ χαρισθέντα (2.12) or τὰ χαρίσματα (12.31) is his emphasis on one body in one Spirit (see. 2.12f.; 12.4,13) and on faithful fellowship on the basis of the ethics of God's field (see. 3.5-9; 4.2,6; 9.11) as parallel to ἀγάπη the ethics of God's building. As shown before, ἀγάπη is parallel to faithfulness in our epistle and thus, ἀγάπη is naturally connected to hope for fruit (9.10; 14.14).

As explained before, ἀγάπη builds up God's building and τὰ πνευματικά are the seeds of the Spirit sown by the Apostle Paul in God's field. In this chapter, it is emphasized that the importance of ἀγάπη in building up God's building is described as parallel to faithfulness in cultivating God's field. Building up God's building with ἀγάπη has something in common with the reason that St. Paul has sown the seeds of the Spirit in God's field- seeking the advantage of many rather than my own advantage (9.22; 10.24,33; 13.5; 14.6).

τὰ χαρισθέντα builds up God's building in that it is used for faithful friendship between fellow believers. Prophecy, superior to tongues due to its intelligibility builds up God's church as long as it seeks the profit of many with ἀγάπη (14.1-19). However, as explained before, there was something wrong with the application of prophecy in the Corinthian church. Where *all speak in tongues* (14.23) and *all prophesy* (14.24), there may have been wicked manipulation by the strong of the weak leading to hostility. If prophetesses seek their own profit against the weak, God will shame them, when what is perfect comes. They will be cursed, if they make a frantic

attempt to puff up themselves and practice gifts against the gospel which clothes the weak with great honour in wisdom in Christ until the end (see. 14.20-38).⁷³

5.2.2. Cultivation of never decaying fruit in God's field (15.1-58)

The risen Christ had appeared to His servants (ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ in 4.1-2) and the faithful servants proclaimed the resurrection of Christ to the Corinthians (15.1-11). Some of the Corinthian church members, however, did not believe resurrection of the dead (15.12) and entertained doubts which might mean 'their labour was in vain' and their belief in the work of the Lord shaken (15.58; cf. 15.10,12-19). And thus, the Apostle Paul deals with the subject of resurrection in ch. 15. There appear multiple overlapping duties for workers for the church of God. The Greek τῷ ἔργῳ τοῦ κυρίου ('the work of the Lord' in 15.58) is described as identifying the Lord's service (διακονία in 3.5; 12.5; 16.15) with God's work (ἐνεργημάτων in 12.6; also see. 3.9). The Apostle Paul as a servant of Christ explains the resurrection of Christ with a metaphor of God's field. Firstly, God's field produces never decaying fruit. The resurrection of Christ St. Paul witnessed and proclaimed is explained as the first fruit in God's field and he proclaims that the field will also produce the saints' resurrection (15.20,23; also see. 15.12-58). Secondly, St. Paul metaphorically depicts Christ being raised from the death (pass. of ἐγείρω in 15.12-17) as parallel to "seeds" (comp. γυμνὸν κόκκον of 15.37 and τῶν σπερμάτων of 15.38 with σῶμα ψυχικόν of 15.44) sown in a field being raised only after dying (15.36,42-44). Thirdly, there is a close analogy between seeds being given a form (15.37-38) and saints wearing the image of the heavenly one (15.49,53-54). As God gives each kind of naked seed its own body, so will He give a never decaying body to all people in Christ.

The work of the Lord (τῷ ἔργῳ τοῦ κυρίου in 9.1; 15.58; 16.10) is described as bearing "abundant" (περισσεύοντες in 15.58; also see 14.12⁷⁴) fruit in God's field (14.14; 15.58; 16.15). The good news that Christ is the first fruit of resurrection is

⁷³ Fuller discussion on this argument will be held in ch. 3 (Re-reading of 1 Cor 14) below.

⁷⁴ In 14.12, pl. πνευμάτων is interpreted as those who are united to the Lord (6.17).

enough to build up the workers' hopes for reaping more abundant fruit. St. Paul has sowed seeds in hope in God's field (9.10-11) and has endured and controlled himself and worked harder than others (see περισσότερον (15:10,58). But evil-unfaithful company ruins the good morals of self-control and endurance expressed as faithfulness to unbelievers (9.4,19-27; 10.23-33) as well as to weak fellow believers (8.10-13; 11.20-34), saying that 'there is no resurrection of the dead, now that let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die' (15.12,32). At this point, the Apostle Paul exhorts the Corinthians to be steadfast, immovable, excelling in the work of the Lord (cf. βεβαιώσει ὑμᾶς ἕως τέλους ἀνεγκλήτους ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ [Χριστοῦ] in 1.8) (15.58).

VI. Letter closing, with final instructions to devote themselves to the services of the saints and of the workers of the Lord through faithful fellowship and to subordinate themselves to the co-workers of the Lord, and greet one another with a holy kiss in ἀγάπη (16.1-24)

6.1. Universal faithful fellowship through the services of the saints and of the workers of the Lord within the churches of God (16.1-12)

In this first section (16.1-12), the Apostle Paul speaks about the collection for the saints (16.1-4), his plan to travel (16.5-9) and the services of the workers of the Lord (16.10-12). He intends to confirm that the Corinthian church will show the virtue of faithfulness which was expected from God's churches, through the collection of the saints and hospitality to the workers of the Lord. In this way, the important theme of faithfulness in 1.9 reappears; and is consistent with the theme of 16.1-12.

First of all, the Apostle Paul exhorts the Corinthian church to exercise responsibility for taking care of the poor within the churches through the collection for the saints. The virtue of caring the weak within the churches of God is the link that holds the

churches together. As for such work of the Lord, St. Paul arranges that he shall send any whom they approve with letters to take their gift to Jerusalem (regarding δοκιμάσητε in 16.3, also see 11.19,28). Faithful fellowship between believers helps not only believers to be approved so as to participate in the table of the Lord, but intimate communication between the tables of the Lord within the churches in order to form one body.

Next, the Apostle announces his travel plans to Corinth (16.5-9). The length of his stay is contingent on their hospitality. Watching how things progress, he will stay in Ephesus until Pentecost and await their reply. He was not the only one who stood in need of warm reception from the Corinthian church. Gorman also explains that 'Paul next writes about two colleagues well known to the Corinthians, his coworker and his successor in Corinth, Timothy and Apollos (16.10-12). Paul seems to expect some hospitality toward Timothy, who is either on the way to Corinth or about to go, no doubt because he represents the now controversial Paul. So Paul requests a safe and hospitable welcome and send-off for Timothy.'⁷⁵

However, the Apostle Paul expresses worry that they might despise Timothy, whom he introduces as his beloved and faithful worker for the church (4.17; 16.10). In light of this, we can imagine how severe their arrogance and hostility toward each other were.

6.2. St. Paul's exhortation to the Corinthian church members to subordinate themselves to co-workers of the Lord and to greet one another with a holy kiss in ἀγάπη (16.13-24)

1.8 is parallel to the second section (16.13-24) in which 16.13-14 captures the gist of the entire section. Gorman argues that 'Paul recapitulates his letter in five brief exhortations, which can perhaps be summarized as an appeal to be firm (in faith and

⁷⁵ Gorman, *Apostle of the Crucified Lord*, p. 282.

hope) and to do everything in love (16.13-14)'.⁷⁶ With respect to the Greek ἀνδρίζεσθε of 16.13, most scholars interpret ἀνήρ as *manly or courageous way*.⁷⁷ On the contrary, A. C. Thiselton points out a possibility of the translation of the Greek in that ἀνήρ has two semantic oppositions: an opposite meaning to 'supposedly feminine qualities' and to 'childish ways.' Consistently with ἀνήρ not only as opposed to νήπιος, but as perfectly compatible with ἀγάπη in 13.11, he renders ἀνδρίζεσθε as 'show mature courage.'⁷⁸ In this regard, St. Paul intends to correct the Corinthian church members' childish behavior such as despising the workers of the Lord (16.15-18) and puffing up themselves with hostility toward each other (16.19-22). As shown before, ἀγάπη has been explained as a method of construction by a skilled-master builder. Now, ἀγάπη is expressed as humility in submission and a respectful attitude towards the Lord's workers (16.15-18).

In addition, Paul the Apostle's teaching of ἀγάπη is connected to greeting one another with a holy kiss (φιλήματι ἀγίῳ of 16.20), which is linguistically consistent with loving the Lord (φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον of 16.22). Here, the Lord is identified with the body of the Lord (2.16; 6.13,17; 8.12; 11.24; 12.12). If St. Paul's curse in 16.22 is explained, even if it was given for the purpose of giving a warning, as his firm determination to inflict severe punishment on those who, do not greet weak brothers and sisters with a holy kiss in Christian fellowship and refuse to participate in the universal table of the Lord from which, external help for the Corinthian weak would have come out (cf. 4.17; 14.9b; 16.10), it would show how severe the problem of divisions not only between the strong and the weak but between the Apostle Paul and the strong, was in the Corinthian church. He closes the epistle with a benediction over the church of God (16.23-24).

⁷⁶ Gorman, *Apostle of the Crucified Lord*, p. 283.

⁷⁷ BAGD, p. 64; also see. Grimm-Thayer, p 43.

⁷⁸ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1336.

3. Re-reading the structure of 1 Corinthians 14

3.1. A table of the structure of 1 Cor 14 in Greek and English

3.1.1. A table of the structure of 1 Cor 14 in Greek

Remapping of the structure of 1 Cor 14: Prophecy and tongues

I. Intelligible speech for building up the church (14.1-19)

1.1. 14.1b-5a: Prophecy builds up the church

14.1a (head)	Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην, ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά,	- intro
1b	μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε.	- a
2	ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσση οὐκ ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ ἀλλὰ θεῷ· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀκούει, πνεύματι δὲ λαλεῖ μυστήρια·	- b
3	ὁ δὲ προφητεύων ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ οἰκοδομῆν καὶ παράκλησιν καὶ παραμυθίαν.	- a
4	ὁ λαλῶν γλώσση ἑαυτὸν οἰκοδομεῖ· ὁ δὲ προφητεύων ἐκκλησίαν οἰκοδομεῖ.	- b - a
5a	θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε·	- b - a
1.2. Interpretation builds up the church in 14.5b-14		
5b (head)	μείζων δὲ ὁ προφητεύων ἢ ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσαις,	- a

- ἐκτός εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύη, ἵνα ἡ ἐκκλησία οἰκοδομὴν λάβῃ. - b
- 6 Νῦν δέ, ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς γλώσσαις λαλῶν, - b
τί ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσω - a
ἐὰν μὴ ὑμῖν λαλήσω ἢ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει ἢ ἐν γνώσει ἢ ἐν προφητείᾳ ἢ
[ἐν] διδαχῇ; - b
- 7 ὅμως τὰ ἄψυχα φωνὴν διδόντα, εἴτε αὐλὸς εἴτε κιθάρα, ἐὰν διαστολὴν
τοῖς φθόγγοις μὴ δῶ, - b
πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ αὐλούμενον ἢ τὸ κιθαριζόμενον; - a
- 8 καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν ἄδηλον σάλπιγξ φωνὴν δῶ, - b
τίς παρασκευάζεται εἰς πόλεμον; - a
- 9 οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς γλώσσης ἐὰν μὴ εὖσημον λόγον δῶτε, - b
πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ λαλούμενον; - a
- 10 ἔσεσθε γὰρ εἰς ἀέρα λαλοῦντες. - a
τοσαῦτα εἰ τύχοι γένη φωνῶν εἰσιν ἐν κόσμῳ καὶ οὐδὲν ἄφωνον. - b
- 11 ἐὰν οὖν μὴ εἰδῶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς, - b
ἔσομαι τῷ λαλοῦντι βάρβαρος καὶ ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοὶ βάρβαρος. - a
- 12-13 ¹² οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἐπεὶ ζηλωταὶ ἐστε πνευμάτων, πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς
ἐκκλησίας ζητεῖτε ἵνα περισσεύητε, ¹³ Διὸ ὁ λαλῶν γλώσση προσευχέσθω ἵνα
διερμηνεύη. - conc

1.3. Singing and speaking in the mind grow the church in number in 14.15-19

- 14 ἐὰν [γὰρ] προσεύχωμαι γλώσση, τὸ πνεῦμά μου προσεύχεται, ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου
ἄκαρπός ἐστιν. - head
- 15 τί οὖν ἐστίν; - question
προσεύξομαι τῷ πνεύματι, προσεύξομαι δὲ καὶ τῷ νοῖ· ψαλῶ τῷ πνεύματι, ψαλῶ δὲ
καὶ τῷ νοῖ. - a

16-17 ἐπεὶ ἐὰν εὐλογῆς [ἐν] πνεύματι, ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ιδιώτου πῶς ἐρεῖ τὸ ἀμὴν ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ; ἐπειδὴ τί λέγεις οὐκ οἶδεν· σὺ μὲν γὰρ καλῶς εὐχαριστεῖς ἀλλ' ὁ ἕτερος οὐκ οἰκοδομεῖται. - b

18-19 Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ, πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις λαλῶ· ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ θέλω πέντε λόγους τῷ νοῦ μου λαλῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ ἄλλους κατηχήσω, ἢ μυρίους λόγους ἐν γλώσσῃ. - conclusion

II. The proper application of the gifts of the Spirit with perfect wisdom, building up with love and the God of peace (14.20-36)

2.1. Imperfect wisdom, wickedness and perfect wisdom (14.20-25)

20 (head) Ἀδελφοί, μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσὶν ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, ταῖς δὲ φρεσὶν τέλειοι γίνεσθε. - head of the second part

21 ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι

ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χεῖλεσιν ἐτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσακούσονται μου,

λέγει κύριος. - a

22 ὥστε αἱ γλώσσαι εἰς σημεῖόν εἰσιν οὐ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπίστοις, ἢ δὲ προφητεία οὐ τοῖς ἀπίστοις ἀλλὰ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν. - b

23-25 ²³ Ἐὰν οὖν συνέλθῃ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ πάντες λαλῶσιν γλώσσαις, εἰσέλθωσιν δὲ ιδιώται ἢ ἄπιστοι, οὐκ ἐροῦσιν ὅτι μαίνεσθε; ²⁴ ἐὰν δὲ πάντες προφητεύωσιν, εἰσέλθῃ δὲ τις ἄπιστος ἢ ιδιώτης, ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων, ἀνακρίνεται ὑπὸ πάντων; ²⁵ τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται, καὶ οὕτως πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον προσκυνήσει τῷ θεῷ ἀπαγγέλλων ὅτι ὄντως ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστίν.

- c

2.2. Perfect wisdom: interpretation of tongues and discernment of prophecy (14.26-31)

26 Τί οὖν ἐστίν, ἀδελφοί; - question

ὅταν συνέρχησθε, ἕκαστος ψαλμὸν ἔχει, διδαχὴν ἔχει, ἀποκάλυψιν ἔχει, γλώσσαν ἔχει, ἐρμηνείαν ἔχει· πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γινέσθω. - head

27 εἴτε γλώσση τις λαλεῖ, κατὰ δύο ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τρεῖς καὶ ἀνὰ μέρος, καὶ εἷς
διερμηνεύτω. - a

28 ἔὰν δὲ μὴ ἦ διερμηνευτὴς, σιγάτω ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, - b

ἑαυτῷ δὲ λαλεῖτω καὶ τῷ θεῷ. - c

29 προφηῆται δὲ δύο ἢ τρεῖς λαλεῖτωσαν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι διακρινέτωσαν, - a

30 ἔὰν δὲ ἄλλω ἀποκαλυφθῇ καθημένῳ, ὁ πρῶτος σιγάτω, - b

31 δύνασθε γὰρ καθ' ἓνα πάντες προφητεύειν, ἵνα πάντες
μανθάνωσιν καὶ πάντες παρακαλῶνται - c

2.3. St. Paul's warning to the Corinthian prophetesses' puffing up in 14.32-38

32-33 ³² καὶ πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται, ³³ οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν
ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεὸς ἀλλὰ εἰρήνης, ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἁγίων - head

34 αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν·

οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, ἀλλὰ ὑποταστέσθωσαν, καθὼς καὶ ὁ
νόμος λέγει. - a

35 εἰ δέ τι μαθεῖν θέλουσιν, ἐν οἴκῳ τοὺς ἰδίους ἄνδρας ἐπερωτάτωσαν·

αἰσχρὸν γὰρ ἐστὶν γυναικὶ λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ. - b

36 ἢ ἀφ' ὑμῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν, ἢ εἰς ὑμᾶς μόνους

κατήντησεν; - c

37-38 ³⁷ Εἴ τις δοκεῖ προφήτης εἶναι ἢ πνευματικός, ἐπιγινωσκέτω ἃ γράφω ὑμῖν ὅτι
κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή; ³⁸ εἰ δέ τις ἀγνοεῖ, ἀγνοεῖται. - conc

III. Conclusive admonition (14.39-40)

39-40 ³⁹ Ὡστε, ἀδελφοί [μου], ζηλοῦτε τὸ προφητεύειν καὶ τὸ λαλεῖν μὴ κωλύετε
γλώσσαις; ⁴⁰ πάντα δὲ εὐσημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω. - conc

3.1.2. A table of the structure of 1 Cor in English

Remapping of the structure of 1 Cor 14: prophecy and tongues

I. Intelligible speech for building up the church (14.1-19)

1.1. Prophecy builds up the church (14.1-5a)

14.1a (head) Pursue love and be eager for the gifts of the Holy Spirit - intro

1b especially that you may prophesy. - a

2 For the person who speaks with tongues does not communicate to human beings but speaks to God. For no one understands anything, but he or she utters *mysterios* with the Spirit. - b

3 On the other hand those who prophesy speak to human beings
for building up,
encouragement
and comfort. - a

4 The person who speaks in a tongue builds up himself or herself, - b
but the person who prophesies builds up the church. - a

5a I would like all of you to speak in tongues, - b
but be eager especially that you may prophesy - a

1.2. Interpretation builds up the church in 14.5b-13

5b (head) The person who prophesies will be of greater importance than the one who speaks in tongues, - a

unless someone interprets in order that the church may receive building up -b

6 But now, dear fellow believers, if I come to you speaking in tongues - b

What shall I profit you, - a

Unless I speak to you in terms either of a disclosure of knowledge, or of prophecy or of teaching? - b

7 Similarly, with reference to an inanimate musical instrument in the case of either a flute or a lyre, unless these give sound distinct differences, - b

how can what is produced by wind or by string be recognized? - a

8 For if the trumpet produces an imperceptible sound, - b

Who will prepare for battle? - a

9 Even so, if you yourselves do not produce through the tongue a message which is readily intelligible, - b

how shall what is being said be comprehended? - a

10 You will be speaking into the air, - a

it may be that there are varieties of sounds in the world, and nothing is without sound. - b

11 If then I do not know the intelligible strength of a sound, - b

I shall be an alien to the speaker, and the speaker will remain an alien to my eyes. - a

12-13 ¹²So with yourselves; since you are eager for spirits, direct this eagerness toward the building up of the church community, to abound in them, ¹³Wherefore the person who prays in a tongue should pray that he or she may interpret. - conc

1.3. Singing and speaking in the mind grow the church in number in 14.14-19

14 If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unfruitful. - head

15 (head) What should be done then? - question

I will pray with my spirit, but I will also pray with my mind. I will sing with my spirit, but I will also sing with my mind. - a

16-17 ¹⁶Otherwise, if you bless (the cup of the Lord) with the spirit [or "in the Spirit"], how can one who occupies the place of catechumen say "Amen" to your

thanksgiving, since he or she does not know what you are saying? ¹⁷For you, on your side, may be giving thanks well enough; but the other, on his or her side, is not being built up. - b

18-19 ¹⁸I thank God that I speak in tongues more than all of you, ¹⁹but in the church I would rather speak five intelligible words with my mind in order to instruct others than ten thousand words in a tongue. - conclusion

II. The proper application of the gifts of the Spirit with perfect wisdom, building up the church with love, and the God of peace (14.20-36)

2.1. Imperfect wisdom, wickedness and perfect wisdom

20 My fellow Christians, do not be children in wisdom. on the contrary, be an infant in matters of evil, but be mature adults in wisdom. - head of the second part

21 In the Law it is written

“with weird tongues and weird lips I will speak to this people and not even then will they listen to me”

says the Lord - a

22 So, tongues are a sign not to believers but to unbelievers; while prophecy is not to unbelievers but to believers. - b

23 ²³ If, then, the whole church community comes together in the same place and everyone is speaking in tongues, and catechumens or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are *μαίνεσθε*? ²⁴ But if all prophecy, and a certain unbeliever or catechumen enters, he is convicted and he is judged by all, ²⁵ the hidden things of his heart are disclosed, and thus he will fall down on his face and worship God and declares that indeed God is in you. - c

2.2. Perfect wisdom: interpretation of tongues and discernment of prophecy (14.26-31)

26 So what shall I do, my dear friends? - question

When you assemble together each contributes a hymn, an item of teaching, something disclosed, or speaking in a tongue or an interpretation. All of these must be done for building up the church. – head

27 If anyone speaks in a tongue, two or at the most three in each part⁷⁹ should speak, and someone must interpret. – a

28 If there is no interpreter, the speaker should keep quiet in the church – b
and speak to himself and God. – c

29 And two or three prophets should speak, and the others weigh what is said. – a

30 And if something is disclosed to another person who is sitting down, the first group should stop speaking. – b

31 For you can all prophesy in turn in order that all may learn and everyone be encouraged. – c

2.3. St. Paul's warning to the Corinthian prophetesses' puffing up (14.32-38)

32-33 (head) ³² And the spirits of prophets are subject to prophets. ³³ For God is not a God of disorder but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints. – head

34 Women should remain silent in the churches.

For it was not allowed for them to speak, but must be in submission, as the Law says, – a

35 if anyone of you wants to learn anything, they should ask their own husbands at home.

For speaking in the church is shameful to women. – b

36 What? Did the word of God originate with you? Or are you the only ones to whom it came? – c

⁷⁹ In here ἀνά μέρος is translated into 'each part' or 'each faithful fellowship' (see. Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα χριστοῦ, καὶ μέλη ἐκ μερῶν in 12.27).

37-38 ³⁷ If anyone thinks that he or she is a prophet or a person of the Spirit, Let them acknowledge that what I am writing to you is the Lord's command. ³⁸ If anyone ignores this, let him be ignorant – conc

III. Conclusive admonition in 14.39-40

39-40 ³⁹ Therefore, my brothers, be eager to prophesy and do not forbid speaking in tongues.
⁴⁰ And everything should be done properly and according to order. – conc

3.2. Critical survey of scholarly views on the structure of 1 Cor 14

How does 1 Cor 14 fit in the whole first epistle to the Corinthians and what sort of structural function does it have? It is also significant to grasp Paul's understanding of speaking with tongues in relation to ἀγάπη and πνευματικά (1 Cor 14.1), inasmuch as Paul's point has been moved from χαρίσματα to πνευματικά. It is difficult, however, due to various scholarly view points and different approaches, to find a consensus as to the relation between ἀγάπη and πνευματικά (12.31 and 14). Unfortunately, furthermore, the consensus that 1 Cor 14.4 is the main key to the whole of chapter 14 has led to misinterpretation of 14.20-25 which is the most significant and puzzling part of ch. 14 in relation to the Pauline concept of speaking in tongues, unless there was no change in the tone of St. Paul's argument about prophecy in 14.20-38.

There are various views on 12.31. J. F. M. Smit claims that 1 Cor 12.31-13.13 as classical rhetoric is corresponding to the *genus demonstrativum* and through this genre 12.31-13.13 should be categorised as an excursus.⁸⁰ H. Conzelmann who prefers Redactional Criticism, describes ch 13 as 'a self-contained unit' and isolates ch 14 from love in ch 13. Based on this argument, he claims that ζηλοῦτε in 12.31 is connected to ζηλοῦτε in 14.1, and ἀγάπη in 14.1 is disconnected to ζηλοῦτε in 14.1 and be linked to 13.13.⁸¹ According to G. D. Fee, some (Baker, M.-A. Chevallier, Martin) have tried to understand ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα in 12.31a as a citation from the Corinthians. They categorize χαρίσματα as the Corinthians' word and πνευματικά as Paul's.⁸² On the contrary, Fee points out that 'that seems to run counter to the rest of the evidence of this letter, namely that πνευματικός was the Corinthian word, which they used vis-à-vis Paul.'⁸³ Richard Hays opposes the argument that 12.31a should be read as 'an accusatory indicative' contrary to Paul's guiding principle in 12.31b, for 12.31a is explained in 14.1 and 14.5 in detail where

⁸⁰ J. F. M. Smit, 'Two Puzzles: 1 Corinthians 12.31 and 13.3: A Rhetorical Solution,' *NTS*, 39 (1993), pp. 246-264.

⁸¹ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 217,233.

⁸² See. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 624, n. 36-39.

⁸³ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 624, n. 39.

ζηλοῦτε indicates the same gift (prophecy) (12.31; 14.1,39).⁸⁴ He rightly stresses that 'love is not a higher or better gift; rather, it is a "way" (12.31b)' for presiding over the gifts of the Spirit in the church.⁸⁵

Several attempts have been made to shine the interpretive light on love, in connection with ch.13, in ch. 14. A. Robertson and A. Plummer pointed out that Paul adopted a regulation of employing χαρίσματα on the basis of love in ch. 14. According to this scheme, prophecy as a gift of teaching is superior to unintelligible speaking with tongues.⁸⁶ C. K. Barrett categorises love as the top among spiritual gifts so that within chs 12-14, love is not only a criterion for other gifts such as tongues and prophecy but the significant means to preserve the unity of body.⁸⁷

A further question is how ἀγάπη, in relation to the gifts of the Spirit, should be interpreted in ch. 14 and what structure the chapter will have. Most scholars⁸⁸ split ch 14 into two parts (vv 1-25 and 26-40). G. Fee portrays ἀγάπη as 'the most excellent way'⁸⁹ and states that there appears to be a chiasmus of A-B-A along the whole first Epistle to the Corinthians by which the 'chiastic' arrangement of chs 12-14 is displayed as 12 (A- more general word)-13 (B- an explanatory argument)-14 (A- a specific response to the matter). Through 14.1-25, Paul tried to correct the Corinthian church members' prayer from unintelligibility (tongues) to intelligibility (prophecy) and with regards to prophecy, the gift is depicted as one for both believers and unbelievers, since an intelligible language not only builds up the church, but also leads unbelievers to conversion. The first part (vv. 1-25) is divided into two (vv. 1-19 for the sake of fellow believers to be edified and vv. 20-25 for the

⁸⁴ Hays, *First Corinthians*, pp. 217, 235-236.

⁸⁵ Hays, *First Corinthians*, p. 222.

⁸⁶ A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, CEC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1911), p. 301.

⁸⁷ C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC (London: Adam&Charles Black, 1968), pp. 297,314-315.

⁸⁸ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 652-713; Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1074-1168; Hays, *First Corinthians*, pp. 233-252; C. S. Keener, *1-2 Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 111-121.

⁸⁹ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 616,625.

sake of unbelievers to be converted).⁹⁰ The second part (14.26-40) outlines the *absolute need for order* in worship over and against disorderliness caused by the church members' simultaneously speaking in tongues; thus, St. Paul gave them guidelines for regulation.⁹¹ R. Hays presents a structure of 12.31 and 14.1a as A-B-B-A: A (τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα in 12.31a) - B (ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν in 12.31b) - B (τὴν ἀγάπην in 14.1)- A (τὰ πνευματικά in 14.1). He describes the key theme of the first part (14.1-25) as the superiority of prophecy over tongues for the benefit of the church⁹² and the key theme of the second part (vv. 26-40) as order in the assembly in accordance with the viewpoint of the first part.⁹³

Dissimilarly from Smit who connects 12.31 to ch. 13,⁹⁴ A. C. Thiselton includes 12.31 in the whole structure of ch 12, but somewhat similarly to Smit, he comprehends it as 'code-switching' from the Corinthian valuation to Paul's. In sharp irony on *greatest gifts* Paul tried to overturn Corinthian church members' gift order.⁹⁵ He, refuting the conventional chiastic pattern (A-B-A'), stresses that Paul's idea of love in ch 13 has penetrated into ch 14 and portrays love as the most significant theme in ch 14.⁹⁶ He, dividing ch. 14 into two parts: vv. 1-25 and vv. 26-40, finds love as most valuable for the first part (vv. 1-25), for it was through intelligible communication that the whole church could promote strong fellowship, while speaking in tongues as opposed to the gifts of God to build up the other, is fruitless and incomprehensible noises, a disintegrating barrier and a discordant jar (14.7-8). The second part (vv. 26-40) tells us in relation to ἀγάπη for the other (8.7-13; 13.1-13) and the differentiation and ordering of gifts by the sovereignty of God (one God, one Lord, and one Spirit) that Paul has explained in 12.4-31 (esp. 12.4-6).⁹⁷

⁹⁰ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 15-16,571,652. More recently, Raymond F. Collins, supporting the conventional chiastic pattern (A-B-A'), connects ch 12 to ch 14. Collins, *First Corinthians*, SPS (Minnesota: Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1999), p. 489.

⁹¹ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 571,688.

⁹² Hays, *First Corinthians*, pp. 235-240.

⁹³ Hays, *First Corinthians*, pp. 241-252.

⁹⁴ Smit, 'Two Puzzles: 1 Cor 12:31 and 13:3: Rhetorical Solution,' pp. 246-264.

⁹⁵ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1024.

⁹⁶ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1024,1074,1082-1084.

⁹⁷ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1074-1077.

However, differently from the structural division of the others (Richard Hays, Gordon Fee, Anthony Thiselton, and Keener) this thesis will divide ch 14 into three parts: vv.1-19, 20-38 and 39-40. Any scholar does not hold an alternative view of which the words ἀγάπη and τὰ πνευματικά reaches till the end of the chapter. Regarding ἀγάπη, Thiselton who most acknowledges the importance of love within ch 14 believes that the motif of love covers only vv. 1-25. Tongues are a childish gift that does not seek the profit of the others. On the contrary ‘the words of the prophets bring home the truth of the gospel in such a way that the hearer “stands under” the verdict of the cross (cf. 1.18-25).’⁹⁸ However, not only should his interpretation be faced with an apparent contradiction between 14.22 and 14.24-25, but it is also difficult to understand how being judged one by one by all (ἀνακρίνεται ὑπὸ πάντων in 14.24) can correspond with ἀγάπη.

ἀγάπη and τὰ πνευματικά (Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην, ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά) in 14.1a play the role of an interpretive yardstick encapsulating the whole chapter. ἀγάπη, penetrating 12.31b to 14.40, is the most significant-interpretative key and the Apostle Paul’s overall argument in ch. 14 will be explained as ‘ἀγάπη (love) building up the church with τὰ πνευματικά (the gifts of the Spirit) and τὰ πνευματικά for which faithful fellowship for the wise application of the gifts of the Spirit in the church is required. In other words, ἀγάπη as parallel to faithful fellowship shows the most excellent way on how to use τὰ πνευματικά for building up the church.

With respect to St. Paul’s attitude to glossolalia, the gift belongs to the body of Christ (12.4-7,12) and should be used not for private spiritual pride but for the benefit of the whole body. O. Michel affirms that the word οἰκοδομέω reflects knowledge-oriented Christian education for the inner growth of the community in various meetings.⁹⁹ In ch. 12, speaking in tongues is described as most inferior and Paul mentions the superiority of prophecy over speaking in tongues (12.10,28-30; cf. 14.1b-5a,39). In ch 14, scholars’ general view of the Christian education through the gifts of the Spirit

⁹⁸ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp.1074,1128.

⁹⁹ O. Michel, ‘οἰκοδομέω,’ in *TDNT*, vol. 5 (G. Friedrich ed) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1967), p. 141.

has shown speaking in tongues as totally unproductive in the congregation. That scheme has portrayed the privately beneficial character of glossolalia to be negative (14.2,4a).¹⁰⁰ Interpreting οἰκοδομέω in 14.4a in the light of 10.23-24, Schrage also depicts speaking in tongues as egoistic and self-indulgent.¹⁰¹

However, according to Thiselton, P. Vielhauer asserts that the word οἰκοδομέω is used as 'double wordplay' (*self-sufficiency* or *self-affirmation* and genuine building up of other people) and 14.4a signifies the former.¹⁰² Thiselton is bewildered at a contradiction tongues have between μυστήρια spoken by the Spirit and οὐδείς γὰρ ἀκούει (no one understands).¹⁰³ Calling the pejorative and sarcastic opinion into question, Fee argues that 'Paul intended no such thing.' He claims that the edifying of oneself is not self-centeredness, but 'the personal edifying of the believer that comes through private prayer and praise' so that mysteries spoken in tongues can give prayers self-edification (see 14.14-15).¹⁰⁴ But the limitation of self-edifying is clear that speaking in tongues is allowed not in the church except at home (14.4,28).

St. Paul says that as long as tongues are interpreted, the gift can give the church numerical growth. In ch 14, the words 'church,' 'thanksgiving,' 'blessing,' and 'come together' reflect on the body of Christ and the table of the Lord. C. K. Barrett and Richard Hays identify συνέρχομαι in 14.23,26 with that in 11.17-34, even though there is no direct mention on the table of the Lord in ch 14.¹⁰⁵ Fee points out that the two verbs, εὐλογέω and εὐχαριστέω in 14.16-17 are used in the same way as in 10.16 and 11.24.¹⁰⁶ Tongues are a gift speaking the hidden *mysteries* of God that reflect both the bread and cup of the Lord, and the resurrection so that catechumens

¹⁰⁰ Michel, 'οἰκοδομέω,' in *TDNT*, V, p. 141; cf. R. G. Gromacki, *Called to Be Saints, An Exposition of 1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, 1977), p. 168; John F. MacArthur, *1 Corinthians*, MANTC (Chicago, Illinois: Moody Pub., 1984), p. 372.

¹⁰¹ W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 3 Teilbd, EKK (Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1999), p. 388.

¹⁰² Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1095; also see. Philipp Vielhauer, *Oikodome: das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom Neuen Testament bis Clemens Alexandrinus* (Heidelberg, 1939), pp. 91-98.

¹⁰³ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1084-1086.

¹⁰⁴ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 657.

¹⁰⁵ Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 324; Hays, *First Corinthians*, p. 241.

¹⁰⁶ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 672, no 35.

were able to receive Christian instruction through the interpretation of tongues spoken from the table of the Lord and to say ἀμήν (14.16). It is therefore likely that building up the church by interpreting tongues means more than the inner growth of church.

Accordingly, Paul insists that both prophecy (14.3-4,26) and the interpretation of tongues (14.5b,12-13,26) build up the church with ἀγάπη. The words οἰκοδομέω and οἰκοδομή occur seven times in ch 14: six in the first part (14.3-4,5b,12,17) and once in the second part (14.26).

The first part (14.1b-19) falls into three sections: vv. 1-5a, vv.5b-13 and vv. 14-19. In the first section (vv. 1-5a), the Apostle Paul compares tongues to prophecy and argues that prophecy is superior over tongues (14.5a), since intelligible utterance builds up the church. The second section (vv. 5b-13) accounts for why glossolalia is described as inferior to prophecy as long as it does not bear fruit through interpretation and thus, the necessity of interpretation for building up the church is emphasized. The third section (vv. 14-19) explains the building up of the church through intelligible gifts in order that both believers and catechumens can be edified in which catechumens (τοῦ ἰδιώτου) are able to say ἀμήν and be guided to the table of the Lord.

The second part (14.20-38) is also divided into three sections (vv. 20-25, vv. 26-31 and vv. 32-38). Generally speaking, in a twisted view point from the first part (14.1-19), in the second part, Paul the Apostle defines tongues as a sign to unbelievers and prophecy as a sign (or a gift) speaking to believers, but it reaches a climax with St. Paul's argument that interpretation is a gift of the Spirit for both unbelievers and believers (14.13-19,22,26-28). 14.22 is a decisive statement to interpret 14.23-31 (38). 14.22-23 displays Paul's worry that unbelievers might misunderstand glossolalia as μάλισθε, as believers made a wrong application of tongues. As shown before, this thesis presupposes that there appear two scenarios of tongues in ch 14: glossolalia with sound and silent glossolalia. On this assumption, the word μάλισθε can be

interpreted as various according to each type of glossolalia.¹⁰⁷ St. Paul's declaration that prophecy is not to unbelievers but to believers in 14.22, would have stemmed from his consideration of the Corinthian situation in which prophetesses practiced prophecy violating St. Paul's guiding principle that believers' speech and actions be judged not by unbelievers but by believers (1 Cor 2-3; 4.6; 6.5-6; 11.19; 14.29). In this regard, the Apostle Paul's pastoral encouragement for building up the church is that whatever is said or done by believers should be judged by believers, as modelled by Paul and Apollos in their presentation of the paradigm of faithful ἀγάπη (3.6; 4.6).

The second part (14.20-38) speaks about using the gifts of the Spirit with respect to wisdom and wickedness. In the first section (14.20-25), the law cited in 14.21 is revealed as evidence that glossolalia is a sign to unbelievers. On this assumption, prophecy comes to become a sign (or a gift) speaking to believers. 14.23-25 exemplifies cases where the gifts of the Spirit are applied in the wrong way.

The second section (14.26-31) explains how to build up the church, in parallel to 14.22, with the gifts of the Spirit such as tongues and interpretation, and prophecy and weighing what is said. Tongues should be a sign not to believers but to unbelievers and prophecy is a gift speaking not to unbelievers but to believers in order to prevent the wrong application of gifts. This prevents what is spoken by believers being judged not by fellow believers (14.24-25) but by unbelievers (14.22,29) and, also what is spoken by the weak being monopolized by the strong.

In the third section (14.32-38), wickedness in 14.20 is connected to disorder in 14.33. In the Corinthian situation of divisions, the prophetesses were puffed up and disregarded their fellow believers (5.6-8; 14.20,36) and besides, they wanted their prophecy to be judged by unbelievers. Thus, the Apostle Paul ordered them to be silent in the church. As opposed to the wicked application of prophecy, wisdom uses prophecy to teach and encourage fellow believers who are despised in the world (cf. 1.28; 11.22). Wisdom dictates that believers prophesy one-at-a-time so no one is disregarded. As such, St. Paul's notorious declaration for feminist theologians that 'women should be silent in the churches' in 14.34 clears himself of a false charge.

¹⁰⁷ See pp. 37-38 and ch. 6 (μαίνεσθε as the opinion of unbelievers in 1 Cor 14.23).

The third part (14.39-40) is a conclusive admonition. The Apostle Paul entreats prophets and people of the Spirit to obey to a command of the Lord. Prophecy is superior but glossolalia, though inferior, is also necessary. Everything should be done in a presentable and orderly manner.

3.3. An explanation of the structure of 1 Cor 14

3.3.1. Intelligible speech for building up the church (14.1-19)

As explained above, most limit the first part to v. 25 and among them, A. C. Thiselton divides it into four (vv. 1-5, vv. 6-12, vv. 13-19 and vv. 20-25);¹⁰⁸ but this thesis has the following three divisions: vv. 1-5a (the superiority of prophecy to tongues), vv. 5b-13 (the necessity of interpreting), vv. 14-19 (the importance of intelligible gifts). The first part (14.1-19) has three sections and three heads (14.1a,5b,14). Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην, ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά in 14.1a is a head of the first part (14.1-19) and a headline for the entire chapter (14.1-40), and 14.18-19 is a conclusion of the first part. And, the first section (14.1-5a) is enclosed in the brackets of 14.1a and 14.5a in which 14.1b-14.5a is enclosed in curly brackets with the expression μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε. The second section (14.5b-13) is blanketed with a head of 14.5b and a conclusion of 14.12-13 and its main theme is explained as tongues can build up the church as long as they are accompanied by interpretation. The third section (14.14-19) is enclosed with a head of 14.14 and a conclusion of 14.18-19 in which its main argument is that speaking with the mind brings the church to growth in number and spirituality.

As shown before, ἀγάπη and τὰ πνευματικά reflect Pauline ecclesiological images. Love builds up the church and τὰ πνευματικά as the greater gifts increase fruits. St. Paul as a worker of God laid a foundation for building up, and he planted and sowed seeds in the field of God and God gave increase (3.6f.; 2 Cor 9.10). Love builds up the church with the greater gifts. Those who speak in tongues build up

¹⁰⁸ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthian*, pp. 1081-1082.

themselves but, on the contrary, both glossolalia without the difference of sound and glossolalia without sound cannot build up the church due to their unintelligibility (14.4-11).

It is through the phrase ἐπεὶ ζηλωταὶ ἐστε πνευμάτων in 14.12 that some think the Corinthian church sought the diversification of manifestations.¹⁰⁹ However, this explanation is faced with a basic contradiction between ἐπεὶ ζηλωταὶ ἐστε πνευμάτων ('since you are eager for spirits') and πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ζητεῖτε ἵνα περισσεύητε ('direct this eagerness toward the building up of the church community, to abound in them'). If it indicates angels, it is hard to understand that St. Paul encouraged the church to build up through angelic aid and the angelic manifestations are encouraged to be excelled (3.10f.; 4.9; 6.3).¹¹⁰ In addition, glossolalia is speaking the mysteries of God in the Spirit, namely the cross and the resurrection (14.2). Conzelmann understands this as a concern about phenomena. Thiselton points out that 'Paul never speaks of "spirituality" in the sense widely used today without implicitly alluding to the Holy Spirit as what makes "spirituality" spiritual.'¹¹¹ Thus, he gives it a free translation into 'the powers of the Spirit.'¹¹²

However, the Apostle Paul never used the plural of πνεῦμα to indicate the Holy Spirit. By any chance, is there any case where St. Paul mentioned a spirit which is encourageable to excel or abound for building up the church? He describes a person who is united to the Lord as one spirit (6.17) who can judge all things with the mind of the Christ (2.15-16) and he persuades believers to pray with the spirit and with the mind also (14.15) rather than pray in tongues with my spirit. 14.1a shows the building image with ἀγάπη and the agricultural image with τὰ πνευματικά. ἀγάπη builds up the church (3.5-9; 8.1; 14.1f.) and τὰ πνευματικά increases the fruit of the church (3.9-11; 9.11; 14.1). τὰ πνευματικά should be judged and interpreted by

¹⁰⁹ See. R. E. Oster, Jr., *1 Corinthians*, CPNIVC (Missouri: College Press, 1995), p. 335.

¹¹⁰ Even if the phrase 'tongues of men and of angels' in 13.1 is somewhat expressed in a positive mood, it has a meaning of hyperbole.

¹¹¹ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1107.

¹¹² Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1106-1107.

πνευμάτων or πνευματικοῖς. If it is the correct understanding, it seems to reflect not so much a plurality of manifestations, as Pauline ecclesiological ideas. Rather it is likely that 14.12 should be interpreted as Paul the Apostle's remedy for the misguided "omnipotence" of the strong πνευμάτων or πνευματικοῖς. Those who are able to judge τὰ πνευματικά are required by St. Paul to speak with the spirit and with the mind also in order to build up God's building. Accordingly, even if some of the Corinthian πνευμάτων were capable of building up themselves with tongues, which they regarded as speaking high-level heavenly wisdom, known by the Apostle Paul as well, tongues would be placed as inferior to intelligible gifts, as long as the gifts are not interpreted.

3.3.1.1. Prophecy builds up the church (14.1-5a)

C. K. Barrett divides the first section of ch 14 from v. 1 to 12. He argues that St. Paul explained the gist in v. 5 but said it over again in v. 6. Barrett further maintains that Paul's argument in 14.1-5, that interpretation has the effect of changing tongues into prophecy and prophecy is superior to tongues, is summarized in 14.12. Therefore, he limits the first section to v. 12.¹¹³ However, an emphasis on prophecy in 14.1 finishes in 14.5a and another emphasis on interpretation is newly added to in 14.5b where interpretation is depicted as equal to prophecy. Others limit the first section to v. 5. According to the chiasmic pattern, R. F. Collins comprehends a love chapter (ch. 13) as a rhetorical digression and he includes 14.1a in the digression of ch 13. He limits the first section v. 1b to v. 5. He connects a topic of 'spiritual gifts' in ch 12 to 14.1b below so that the greater gifts in 12.31 are emphasized along with prophecy in 14.1f.¹¹⁴ G. Fee, with the chiasmic pattern, understands the main theme of ch 14 as 'spiritual gifts' and the key theme of the first half (14.1-25) as intelligibility, and he divides it into two: vv. 1-19 and vv. 20-25 and the first section is subdivided into three: vv. 1-5, vv. 6-12 and vv. 13-19. In the first section (vv. 1-5) the key issue is explained as intelligibility for fellow believers' edification.¹¹⁵ Thiselton also limits

¹¹³ Barrett, p. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 312-319.

¹¹⁴ Collins, *First Corinthians*, pp. 489-491.

¹¹⁵ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 652-653.

the first section of the first part v. 1 to v. 5 and he depicts love as its key theme. And then, 12.31 is connected to 14.1. The greatest gifts are explained as prophecy, and love is superior to prophecy. In this regards, ch 13 is able to be smoothly connected to ch 14. Spiritual gifts are 'given for the service of others, not for self-affirmation.'¹¹⁶ However, their restriction of the first section to v. 5 looks somewhat problematic, since 14.5b narrates a new subject- interpretation is equal to prophecy.

As shown before, ἀγάπη and τὰ πνευματικά (the greater gifts) in 14.1a are the most significant interpretative key for the whole chapter 14. The first section (14.1b-5a) is bracketed with the expression μᾶλλον δὲ ἴνα προφητεύητε. Within the first section, τὰ πνευματικά in 14.1a is linked to prophecy (also see 14.39). St. Paul emphasizes the application of prophecy for believers' benefit, but tongues are depicted as inferior to prophecy. Speaking with a language only God understands is regarded as less important for the church, if it does not bear the fruit of the mind (νοῦς) through intelligibility, even though it speaks about the mysteries of God with ἀγάπη. Prophecy builds up the church but tongues build up individuals. The Apostle said the Corinthians' self-interested practice to be blamable, but the criticism is not for tongues themselves (14.18,39). V. 5a is St. Paul's concluding recommendation that will be repeated in the conclusion of the first part (vv. 18-19) and of the chapter (vv. 39-40).

3.3.1.2. Interpretation builds up the church (14.5b-13)

Most scholars find a parallel between 14.5b and 14.20-31 in relation to the equality of interpretation to prophecy but not the importance of interpretation for evangelizing unbelievers in the Corinthian situation (see. an expectation of catechumens' saying ἀμήν in 14.16 and the unintelligible word of the Lord given to unbelievers in 14.21-22) in which a need for prophecy to be judged by believers is an issue. Regarding ecclesiology in ch 12, a tongue belongs to the whole body of Christ, and all the

¹¹⁶ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1074, 1083-1084.

divine oracles of glossolalia uttered with the Spirit are equal to prophecy as long as it is beneficial to the church. Tongues can offer a private benefit but are incompetent to convert unbelievers into Christians. Rather interpretation is described as an essential gift for the conversion of unbelievers in ch 14. R. Hays suggests that ‘the term “prophecy” should be read throughout chapter 14 as synecdoche for all forms of intelligible speech gifts that edify the church.’ He puts all the four gifts giving intelligible sounds such as revelation, knowledge, prophecy, and teaching into the same category.¹¹⁷ However, what identifies interpretation with prophecy for the conversion of unbeliever results in leading to read 14.22 as Paul’s logical mistake.¹¹⁸

C. K. Barrett interprets 14.5b such that interpretation takes effect to convert tongues to prophecy.¹¹⁹ This shows the importance of interpretation as much as prophecy in the whole chapter which is re-explained in 14.20-31. However, he has a tendency to identify interpretation with prophecy so that he seems not to be aware of the logical inconsistency between 14.22 and 14.23-25 in full.¹²⁰

As was mentioned above, Fee who introduces the general issue of ch 14 as edification through intelligibility rather than love through intelligibility asserts that the key topic of the second section (14.6-12) is useless of unintelligibility for edification.¹²¹ Fee also has a tendency to identify interpretation with prophecy.¹²² Certainly, St. Paul emphasizes interpretation and prophecy together in 14.5b and that all the intelligible speech benefits the church (14.6). What is more, St. Paul says that speaking with *voûc* includes all the intelligible gifts in the last section (vv. 14-19). However, reading 14.20-25 in order finds 14.20-31 to be a logically non-disconnected structure in which the Corinthian church is required to evangelize unbelievers through interpretation rather than prophecy in the Corinthian situation. If so,

¹¹⁷ Hays, *First Corinthians*, p. 237.

¹¹⁸ Refer to Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, p. 242; Hays, *First Corinthians*, pp. 239-240.

¹¹⁹ Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 316,319..

¹²⁰ Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 323-327.

¹²¹ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 660-661.

¹²² Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 662,682-683.

although interpretation and prophecy should be put into the same category of τὰ πνευματικά, it seems as much in the dark as ever as to whether prophecy was recommended as a proper gift for the conversion of unbelievers.

Based on chiasmic analysis, Raymond Collins maintains that as ‘Paul’s digression’ 14.6-12 corresponds to the central section in the first part and with respect to a theme of ἀγάπη he explains, through analogies, how a properly distinguished sound is beneficial to the church worship.¹²³ According to Margaret Mitchell pointing out a rhetorical regularity of “what profits,” St. Paul says that the proper application of spiritual gifts demonstrates love and is a benefit to the church.¹²⁴ Thiselton is somewhat sympathetic with Paul’s use of analogy explained by H. M. Gale¹²⁵ and says that ‘Paul uses many more analogies, models, and illustrative or creative pictures than those who portray him as a more abstract thinker recognize.’¹²⁶ Thiselton limits the second section to 14.6-12. His structuring of the second section into 14.6-12 that narrates a need for making indistinguishable sound distinguishable sound, looks somewhat reasonable, but his dividing of the second section makes 14.5b unaffiliated.

Why did Thiselton, alongside the other scholars, not include interpretation in 14.5b to our second section (14.5b-13)? Thiselton claims that those who spoke in tongues were ‘not professional in shaping of words’ so that he translates διερμηνεύω as ‘put into words.’ The non-literate division eagerly desired speaking in tongues and it put up a barrier within the church.¹²⁷ However, this approach to the gifts of the Spirit in connection with literacy seems ill-matched to 14.13. The reason why Paul wanted the Corinthian church members to interpret was not only for the benefit of the church

¹²³ Collins, *First Corinthians*, p. 495.

¹²⁴ Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, pp. 58-60.

¹²⁵ H. M. Gale, *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 129-134.

¹²⁶ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1100-1101.

¹²⁷ A. C. Thiselton, ‘The “Interpretation” of Tongues: A New Suggestion in the Light of Greek Usage in Philo and Josephus,’ *JThS* (1979), pp. 15-36.

but also for unbelievers' conversion. In this way, interpretation is distinguished from prophecy, even though they are assigned to the same category of τὰ πνευματικά. Otherwise, 14.22 will be St. Paul's logical mistake. St. Paul compared tongues to prophecy in the first section (14.1-5a). Paul describes the second section (14.5b-13) on the basis of love for building up the church (14.3,5-12,22b) which is not so much rhetorical digression as an essential issue.

As partially explained before, the reason why 14.5b should be included in the second section is as follows. Firstly, the first section (14.1-5a) is enclosed by the expression μάλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε, in which tongues are compared to prophecy and it says about the superiority of prophecy over tongues in intelligibility. Secondly, but for the "if" (εἰ) in 14.5b, it would have been an explanation of the reason why tongues were inferior to prophecy and it would have belonged to the first section. However, with the "if" of 14.5b, the second section narrates a new topic. Speaking in tongues can be intelligible not through prophecy, but through interpretation, so that they will be equal to prophecy, as tongues are interpreted.

An argument of "building up the church through interpretation" appears as an introduction in 14.5b and the argument is repeated in the conclusion of 14.12-13 so that the second section is enclosed with an introduction and a conclusion. The second section has a structure of a (effect) – b (cause). Causal clauses (b) always have "if" (14.5b-11) except vv. 12-13 of a conclusion. The "if" clauses of (b) play an important part in the second section in that they explain the reasons of (a) (effect) in 14.5b and show a dominant characteristic of (b) as such. The (b) clauses are divided into two, using v. 10 as a dividing ridge: (b) with ";" (question) (14.6-9) and (b) without ";" (14.10-11). Within the 4 if clauses with ";" (14.6-9), 'what shall I profit you?' of 14.6 (a) is repeated as 'how can be recognized?' of 14.7, 'who will prepare for battle?' of 14.8, 'how shall what is being said be comprehended?' of 14.9. 14.7-11 is one of the most difficult interpretive problems in the first part (14.1-19), because two types of tongues are found in the text. 14.7 depicts why glossolalia with sound is unprofitable; 14.8-9 explain the reason why glossolalia without sound is unprofitable

and 14.10-11 without “;” explain the reason why glossolalia without sound is misunderstood as speaking into air.

With respect to tongues, within the body of the second section (14.6-11), the part of 14.6-9 with “;” depicts the subject of an act as a speaker but on the contrary the part of 14.10-11 without “;” describes the subject of an act as a hearer. The expression of γὰρ ἐάν does not appear in vv. 6-7. The structure of ‘because-if … so-if’ (γὰρ- ἐάν … οὕτως ἐάν) in 14.8-9 is restated as ‘because-if … then-if’ (γὰρ-εἰ … ἐάν οὖν) in 14.10-11. In this regard, the emphasis of glossolalia without sound comes to a climax with the last two sentences: ‘because-if … so-if’ among four sentences with “;” of 14.6-9 and it is re-emphasized with two sentences of ‘because-if … then-if’ without “;” of 14.10-11.

V. 7 speaks about glossolalia with sound. Through the expression ‘unless these give sound distinct differences, how can what is produced by wind or by string be recognized?’ (ἐάν διαστολήν τοῖς φθόγγοις μὴ δῶ, πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ αὐλούμενον ἢ τὸ κιθαριζόμενον;), one can know that v. 7 certainly is about glossolalia with sound. A wind instrument in 14.7 is limited to the trumpet in 14.8 and the distinct difference of sound between a wind instrument and a string instrument in 14.7 is changed into silent sound (ἄδηλον σάλπιγξ φωνήν). The graves in Lk 11.44 are not perceptible to eyes and the sound in 1 Cor 14.8 is not perceptible to ears. If we interpret ‘ἄδηλον φωνήν,’ ‘μὴ εὔσημον,’ ‘εἰς ἄερα λαλοῦντες,’ and ‘τὴν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς’ in 14.8-11 as indicating the meaningless sound of glossolalia with sound, it will be inevitable to freely translate ἄφωνον of 14.10 as ‘meaningless.’ On the other hand, what renders the ‘ἄφωνον’ of 14.10 into ‘without sound’ will have to be able to explain how the Greek ἄφωνον is coherently connected to the expressions ‘ἄδηλον φωνήν,’ ‘μὴ εὔσημον,’ ‘εἰς ἄερα λαλοῦντες,’ and ‘τὴν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς’ in 14.8-11. At any rate, it is likely that φθόγγος (sound) of v. 7 can be separated from ἄφωνον (without sound) of v. 10.

With respect to the possible type of silent tongue the Apostle Paul identifies that

glossolalia speaking the mysteries of God with uncertain (ἄδηλον) sound is from God (1 Cor 14.2,8). So it seems to be an odd coincidence between Philo and St. Paul that God describes His mysteries with uncertain (ἄδηλος) sound. However, the possible type of silent (ἄδηλον) sound St. Paul refers to is different from that Philo describes. Firstly, the God St. Paul depicts is different from that Philo explains. The God St. Paul gives an account of is distinguished from the God who dwells in the darkness of air Philo depicts. Secondly, the contents of mysteries St. Paul explains are different from that Philo depicts. Paul's mysteries indicate the cross and the resurrection being revealed by the Spirit, which are not found in Philonic concept of mysteries.

Regarding vv. 9-10, this thesis proposes a change of the structure of the verses into the inclusion of ἔσεσθε γὰρ εἰς ἄερα λαλοῦντες in v. 10. Most scholars include the expression of ἔσεσθε γὰρ εἰς ἄερα λαλοῦντες in v. 9. However, according to our new structure presented above, vv. 8-9 are presented as a bundle of 'for (because)-if ... so-if' (γὰρ- ἐάν ... οὕτως ἐάν) constructions and vv. 10-11 are presented as another bundle of 'for (because)-if ... then-if' (γὰρ-εἰ ... ἐάν οὖν) constructions. The γὰρ- ἐάν clause of v. 8 is a metaphorically causal effect for a cause and effect relationship in the οὕτως ἐάν clause of v. 9. In a similar way, the γὰρ-εἰ clause of v. 10 is a causal effect for a cause and effect relationship in the ἐάν οὖν clause of v. 11. In this way, the causal effect of vv. 8-9 reached a climax within vv. 6-9 with ";" is emphasized again within the extended structure of vv. 6-11.

3.3.1.3. Singing and speaking in the spirit and in the mind build up the church (14.14-19)

Most scholars (Barrett, Collins, Conzelmann, Fee, Hays, Keener, Schrage, Thiselton, Thomas Aquinas) limit the third section to vv. 13-19.¹²⁸ They read the main subject of the third section to be the superiority of intelligible gifts to unintelligible tongues. However, as explained before, they did not find that v. 5b parallels with vv. 12-13 and thus, they missed not only emphasis on interpretation in the second section

¹²⁸ Garland divides the first part into two: vv. 1-5 and vv. 6-19. See. *1 Corinthians*, pp. 630-631.

(14.5b-13) but also dramatic emphasis on speaking with the mind in the third section (14.14-19).

In the first section (14.1-5a), the Apostle Paul mentioned the superiority of prophecy to tongues and in the second section (14.5b-13), the necessity of interpretation to equalize tongues with prophecy. Now in the third section (14.14-19), the Apostle emphasizes the significance of intelligible gifts for increasing fruit in the field of God and for building up the building of God. The third section has the following structure: head (v. 14) – a (v. 15) – b (vv. 16-17) - conclusion (vv. 18-19); it thus begins with τὰ πνευματικά (speaking with the mind) and ends with τὰ πνευματικά (speaking with the mind). In here, the emphasized St. Paul's πνευματικά are the greater gifts of the Spirit and people of the Holy Spirit who are equipped with the gifts such as disclosure, knowledge, prophecy, teaching, and interpretation are able to teach catechumens (ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου in v. 16) as well as fellow believers in the church. With these gifts, people of the Spirit can build up the church with ἀγάπη and increase fruit in the field of God.

V. 13 should be included into the second section, since the second section (vv. 5b-13) elaborates on the necessity of the particular gift of interpretation among the greater gifts for building up the church; but in the third section (vv. 14-19), speaking with τὰ πνευματικά (the greater gifts) is re-expressed as speaking with the mind, which is regarded as superior to speaking in tongues. The reason why the importance of interpretation among the greater gifts should have been considered will be a bit more explained in the second part (14.20-36). V. 14 is the head of the third section, beginning with the causal effect of ἐὰν [γάρ] that outlines the entire third section of the first part (vv. 14-19) explaining the reason why my mind is unfruitful as I speak in tongues. V. 15 gives an answer to the problem raised at the beginning and besides, the argument at the beginning of the section is restated in the conclusion of vv. 18-19. In this way, St. Paul uses parenthesis to enclose the third section with head of v. 14 and conclusion of vv. 18-19.

The necessity for a speaker to be considerate of a hearer forms part of the climax of vv. 8-11; we note a similar pattern of 'for-if ... then-if' occurs in vv. 14-16 (comp. 'for - if ... then-if,' γὰρ-εἰ ... ἐὰν οὖν in vv. 10-11 to 'for-if ... what should I do then-if' ἐὰν [γάρ] ... τί οὖν ἐστίν- ἐὰν in vv. 14-16). An 'if' clause has appeared repeatedly in relation to glossolalia in the second section (vv. 5b-11). These 'if' clauses reflect the expression 'if-the church may not be built up' in 14.5b. It echoes in the third section as well. The expression 'for-if ... then-if' (γὰρ-εἰ ... ἐὰν οὖν) in vv. 10-11 is restated as in vv. 14-16. 'τί οὖν ἐστίν;' in v. 15 is expressed to draw a conclusion in the third section and the conclusive argument of v. 15 is re-expressed in vv. 18-19. V. 15 is a guiding principle for speakers with tongues and vv. 16-17 explain St. Paul's worry that if tongues speakers speak in the unintelligible gifts of the Spirit, not taking hearers into consideration, the communication gap would obstruct the numerical growth of the church as well as its edification. A guiding motif in the first part is how to use a tongue as an organ in relation to ἀγάπη and τὰ πνευματικά. The Apostle Paul encourages the Corinthians to speak in tongues with ἀγάπη by the Holy Spirit and to speak five words with the mind united to Christ (see. 2.16; 6.17) rather than ten thousand words in tongues. Even though tongues speak blessing and thanksgiving, because the gift does not give an intelligible sound, it will be unreasonable to build up the other with the unintelligible blessing and thanksgiving. ἀγάπη should be expressed in intelligible and audible ways for the profit of the other; otherwise, not only is the building of God not built up, no matter how excellent the building materials are but also the seeds sowed in the field of God cannot grow and increase fruit, despite the excellent activities of God's workers that have planted and watered.

3.3.2. The proper application of the gifts of the Spirit with perfect wisdom, building up with love and the God of peace (14.20-38)

1 Cor 14.20-25 has been considered as one of the most difficult problems in our epistle. Literature has emerged that offers contradictory findings about logical incoherency between 14.22 and 14.23-25. The variations in much published research on this issue leads modern readers to interpret 14.22 by 14.23-25 and as a result, not

only is 14.22 read as St. Paul's logical mistake, but also prophecy as perfect (mature) wisdom. In this regard, most interpret the Greek τῆ κακίᾳ of 14.20 as indicating the foolish (imperfect) application of glossolalia in the assembly. Based on this assumption, commentators (Fee,¹²⁹ Collins,¹³⁰ Thiselton,¹³¹ and Hays¹³²) insert 14.20-25 into the first part where the main motif is the superiority of intelligible gifts in the church, and the second part (14.26-40) is about the ordering of gifts.

Recently, with respect to an endeavour to solve the problem of incoherency between 14.22 and 14.23-25, A. C. Thiselton raised an objection to the traditional view, which regards tongues as childish talk. Instead, there is a possibility that tongues were not considered childish, but rather understood as overlapping with angelic tongues by the Corinthians and Paul.¹³³ As for the contradiction between 14.22 and 14.23-25, more recently, S. J. Chester tried to resolve the problem that tongues are a gift to be attractive to unbelievers and prophecy speaks about the gospel through which unbelievers were able to be converted to Christianity.¹³⁴

However, this idea is confronted with other interpretive problems that not only 14.22a is contradictory to 14.21, but 14.22b is contradictory to 14.24-25; furthermore, some argue that mysteries spoken with glossolalia (14.2) indicate the gospel.¹³⁵ We cannot finish our treatment of this issue without considering the clear conclusion of 14:10: glossolalia without sound has never been found in the world (14.10). In this

¹²⁹ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 652.

¹³⁰ Collins, *First Corinthians*, p. 511.

¹³¹ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1074f.

¹³² Hays, *First Corinthians*, pp. 233-240.

¹³³ Thiselton, 'The "Interpretation" of Tongues: A New Suggestion in the Light of Greek Usage in Philo and Josephus,' p. 32; also see. Hurd Jr., *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*, pp. 112-113.

¹³⁴ Chester, 'Divine Madness? Speaking in Tongues in 1 Corinthians 14.23,' pp. 417-446. It will be further discussed below on this topic (esp. see. ch. 4 of this thesis).

¹³⁵ M. W. Meyer (ed), *The Ancient Mysteries* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), pp. 252-254; D. A. Carson, 'Mystery and Fulfillment: Toward a More Comprehensive Paradigm of Paul's Understanding of the Old and the New,' in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, Vol. 2 (D. A. Carson, P. T. O'Brien, and M. A. Seifrid eds.) (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), pp. 413-425.

regard, it is likely that Paul the Apostle's tongues are incompatible with the tongues of angels, and the Greek μαίνεσθε should be interpreted negatively. As such, the issues raised in 14.22 extend beyond 14.25.

This thesis suggests enclosing the second part in the brackets of 14.20 and 14.38, and dividing into three: vv. 20-25, vv. 26-31, and vv. 32-38 in which each section will have a head (v. 20, v. 26, and vv. 32-33). ἀγάπη described not as boastful, puffed up, and seeking its own (13.4,-5) for building up God's building, is paraphrased as perfect wisdom in applying gifts such as tongues and prophecy. Such wisdom does not patronize the weak in Christ (4.10; 14.20). As argued in this thesis, in 14.20-38 Paul the Apostle says that perfect wisdom is to show faithfulness to the weak, by two or three believers speaking in tongues to unbelievers and prophesying to believers with believers judging the output, so the strong do not to patronize the weak. As shown before, ἀγάπη is parallel to Christian morality of faithfulness for τὰ πνευματικά and in this regard, with no τὰ πνευματικά, a companion of ἀγάπη, no a conclusion in each section. The theme of the second part will be explained as imperfect wisdom (foolishness), perfect wisdom and wickedness. V. 20 outlines the whole of the second part the same as v. 1a does. In this way, ἀγάπη still plays a role of the yardstick for measuring the whole chapter through the word οικοδομέω. Wickedness is depicted as an antithesis to ἀγάπη (perfect wisdom). The Apostle Paul often describes Christians as trees (Rom 1.13; 6.21,22; 7.4,5; 15.28; 1 Cor 14.14; 2 Cor 9.10; Gal 5.22-23; Eph 5.9,11; Phil 1.11; 4.17; Col 1.6,10; Ti 3.14; also see Prov. 3.13,18; Wisd 3.15-16; 1 En 32.3 in which wisdom (φροσύνη) is described as a tree; also refer to Ps 1; 92.12-13.). The wisdom (φροσύνη) of 1 Cor 14.20 indicates the Corinthian church members. He metaphorically portrays the Corinthians as the field of God and the greater gifts of the Spirit as trees planted in or seeds spread in this field. The trees are portrayed, not as ornamental trees, but as fruit trees (9.7,11; 14.14). He emphasizes wisdom not only building up God's building with ἀγάπη but bearing fruit with the greater gifts in God's field.

On the contrary Wickedness indicates the boasting (καύχημα) or puffing up (φυσιώω) of some elites who had γνῶσις (5.6-8; 8.1f.; Rom 1.29-32).¹³⁶ Wickedness is identified as the fundamental problem in the Corinthian church as to the foolish application of the gifts of the Spirit and unfair treatment of weak believers, but contrary to that perfect wisdom is described as pastoral wisdom to cure the problem. Perfect wisdom as St. Paul's pastoral remedy is the proper use of the gifts for the order of the church. If weak believers are honoured by interpretation by a fellow believer, the Christian community is united in fellowship and ἀγάπη through the appropriate application of prophecy, then the gifts are being correctly used. In order to show the perfect wisdom, amidst divisions within the church, strong believers are required to humble themselves and become weak to the weak (1 Cor 9.15-22; Phil 2.3-8). It is through the word φρεσίν that the Apostle Paul as a wise master builder explains the wisdom behind building up God's building; this wisdom awards the greater honour to the foolish who has been chosen by God (1.27-30; 4.10; 12.24).

With reference to speaking in tongues, on the one hand, foolish believers had no γνῶσις that 'there is no other God but one'. If, therefore, the strong let foolish believers keep speaking in tongues only to believers without interpretation, foolish believers would fail to show their righteousness to Jewish unbelievers with γνῶσις (see. 6.1f.; 14.23). However, judgment on believers by unbelievers should have been discouraged. On the other hand, if the foolish speak in tongues and a faithful friend interprets it, unbelievers with γνῶσις would respond to their unintelligible

¹³⁶ Wis 3.12-16 speaks of a blessing on the wise and a curse (punishment) on the foolish (wicked). A punishment (or a curse) on the boasting wicked in 1 Cor 14.20-36 could be explained in relation to 4.21; 5.13; 11.29-30, if the wickedness of 14.20 indicates the puffing up of prophetesses (14.36) who disregarded weak fellow believers who have put on Christ and been treated as wise (φρόνιμοι) in Christ (4.10) and wanted their prophecies judged by unbelievers. If the Greeks both φιλήματι of 16.20 and φιλεῖ of 16.22 in greetings to fellow believers in 16.19-24 indicate the body of the Lord (11.29), an interpretive tension between a blessing and a curse in 14.20 can be found. If this is the correct understanding, St. Paul's order given to the women prophets to be silent seems to serve as prevention against punishment to them. Regarding the view that St. Paul objected to the puffing up of the Corinthian women prophets that 'overwhelmed others who do not participate as fully,' refer to A. C. Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1990), pp. 184-189.

mysteries of God as saying ἀμήν (14.2,16). In this way, the God of foolish believers would be identified as the same God of the strong with γνῶσις (12.24).

With respect to prophesying, if all prophesy to unbelievers, believers will be judged by unbelievers, worsening the problem of the divisions in the church. On the contrary, if they prophesy to fellow believers in the way that two or three speak, and the others weigh what is said, it will build up the church.

Admittedly, the first section (14.20-25) explains “imperfect wisdom” (παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φροσίν) in relation to the application of the gifts of the Spirit within the assembly. In v. 21, the law is cited as evidence that tongues are a sign to unbelievers. V. 22 shows St. Paul’s guiding principle for perfect wisdom as opposed to wickedness within the situation of the Corinthian church, lest prophecy dominate over other gifts. Tongues should be a sign to unbelievers insofar as God’s foolishness is wiser than human wisdom (1.25). Even if unbelievers had γνῶσις, because they had no Christian knowledge, they should have listened to the wisdom interpreted from the foolish; those who have been chosen by God (3.22-23). Prophecy should be a sign (a gift) speaking to believers to express love for the most inferior fellow believers of the Corinthian church (6.7-8; 16.20). Vv. 23-25 describe imperfect wisdom as the problem of the Corinthian believers being judged by unbelievers due to their misapplication of the gifts of the Spirit.

The second section (14.26-31) depicts the perfect wisdom shown in 14.22 that tongues are a sign to unbelievers to give the weak authority as equal as the strong believers’ and that prophecy is a gift speaking to believers for the order of the church of which God is faithful through believers (1.9) and saints judge the world (6.2-3).

The third section (14.32-38) portrays the puffing up of the women prophets that brought disorder to the one table in Christ God created. They needed to learn concession which was a command of the Lord given to them (9.27); otherwise there

would be a curse on them (14.20,38) that has been caused by their evil puffing up, leavening 'the whole batch of dough' (5.6-8; 14.20; Rom 1.28-32). The righteous judgment for weak believers despised will be fulfilled by Christ who has waited at the end of the time (4.5). Until then, God will show His patience (Rom 3.25; 1 Cor 13.4).

3.3.2.1. Perfect wisdom and the proper application of the gifts of the Spirit (14.20-25)

1 Cor. 14.23-25 have received much scholarly attention and yet the great difficulty lies with the logical disconnection between 14.22 and 14.23-25. As Robert J. Gladstone pointed out, but for 14.22, 14.20-25 would have been well displayed in a logical fashion.¹³⁷ Karl Sandnes says that Paul's argument in 14.20-25 is 'somewhat enigmatic.'¹³⁸ Conzelmann regards 14.22 as Paul's immoderate rhetorical expression.¹³⁹ Hays understands 14.22 merely as 'an exegetical comment' on 14.21 and logical confusion by Paul himself.¹⁴⁰ In a similar way to Jean Héring,¹⁴¹ B. C. Johanson attempted to solve the inconsistency through rendering v. 22 as a rhetorical question.¹⁴² Barrett appears to largely ignore the contradiction between 14.22 and 14.23-25.¹⁴³ According to general scholarly agreement, St. Paul, except in 14.22, seems to say that unintelligible speech cannot edify or convert unbelievers to Christianity in 14.20-25. 14.22 certainly reverses St. Paul's opinion. According to Jean

¹³⁷ Gladstone, 'Sign Language in the Assembly,' p. 179.

¹³⁸ K. O. Sandnes, 'Prophecy: A Sign for Believers (1 Cor 14,20-25),' *Biblica* 77 (1996), p. 15.

¹³⁹ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, p. 242.

¹⁴⁰ Hays, *First Corinthians*, p. 239-240.

¹⁴¹ J. Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (London: The Epworth Press, 1962), p. 152. After asking why glossolaly is 'a sign for unbelievers' and prophecy 'a sign for believers,' he concludes that the exact opposite reading would be expected.

¹⁴² Johanson, 'Tongues, A Sign for Unbelievers?,' pp. 180-203.

¹⁴³ Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 323-327.

Héring, Paul gave a question as to why tongues are a sign for unbelievers and prophecy is a sign for believers and then, expected a reversal consequence.¹⁴⁴

The chaos of 14.20-25 has brought about misinterpretation of the whole of chapter 14 and a missing structural coherence in 14.20-36. In this chaos, most scholars¹⁴⁵ have tried to explain 14.22 from the context of 14.23-25, by what is called 'bottom upward' reading. As mentioned above, however, this reading leads modern readers to understand 14.22 as a rhetorical mistake caused by Paul's own confusion and to give a free translation faced with two exegetical difficulties. Firstly, in relation to 14.22a, 14.23 remains as one of the most confused texts in 1 Corinthians. However, no matter what even if we translate the Greek *μαίνεσθε* of 14.23 positively, to solve the contradiction between 14.22a and 14.23 raised by reading it negatively, 14.22b still stands as Paul's 'logical mistake. Recently, Stephen Chester assumed that in 14.20-25 'Paul hypothetically compares the impact of experiencing the two gifts upon those who are not already Christians.'¹⁴⁶ He interprets *μαίνεσθε* of v. 23 as divine madness in Greco-Roman religious evidence.¹⁴⁷ However, this interpretive estimate should be confronted with the exegetical contradiction between a negative expectation of this people in 14.21b ('not even will they listen to me') and a positive response by unbelievers in 14.23.

With respect to the inconsistency of 14.22b with 14.24-25, A. C. Thiselton objected to M. Roebeck, Jr's endeavour to solve the problem that 'prophecy is addressed only to the believing community and must not to be confused with kerygma or gospel proclamation.' Instead along with Hill, Gillespie, and Müller, Thiselton maintains that 'prophetic speech enacts judgment and grace, and combines a speech-act of

¹⁴⁴ Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, p. 152.

¹⁴⁵ Collins, *First Corinthians*, pp. 504-511; Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 680-688; Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1118-1130; Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, p. 406-414; Barclay, '1 Corinthians,' p. 1129; Chester, 'Divine Madness? Speaking in Tongues in 1 Corinthians 14.23,' pp. 417-446.

¹⁴⁶ Chester, 'Divine Madness? Speaking in Tongues in 1 Corinthians 14.23,' p. 417.

¹⁴⁷ Chester, 'Divine Madness? Speaking in Tongues in 1 Corinthians 14.23,' pp. 417-446.

gospel promise with pastoral exhortation.¹⁴⁸ However, Thiselton's view that 14.24-25 represents the proper use of prophecy for unbelievers' conversion to Christianity could not resolve the contradiction either. For, to not mention the contradiction between v. 22 and vv. 23-25, St. Paul's guiding principle for the proper application of prophecy in v. 22b (also v. 29)- that prophets should speak to fellow believers in order that believers will judge prophecy spoken by believing prophets- is inconsistent with the description in 14.24-25 that all prophesy and unbelievers judge the Corinthian prophecy.

On the other hand, Johanson¹⁴⁹ and Smit¹⁵⁰ have attempted to explain 14.23-25 by 14.22. As mentioned above, Johanson read v. 22 as a rhetorical question, and Smit translates v. 22 as 'The tongues are proper not to the believers but to the unbelievers; the prophecy, however, is proper not to the unbelievers but to the believers,' but failed to elucidate the conflict between 14.22b and 14.24-25. Gladstone interpreted believers and unbelievers in 14.22 not as existing, but potential believers and unbelievers¹⁵¹ and translates the dative τοῖς πιστεύουσιν/τοῖς ἀπίστοις as 'resulting in believers/unbelievers.'¹⁵² Although his translation seems to solve the difficult problem in 14.20-25, surely it is a liberal translation of the text and besides, the way the Corinthians used the gift (all prophesy), as described in 14.24, is contradictory to the Apostle's guiding principle (two or three prophets should speak) shown in 14.29.

At any rate, in these circumstances where scholars have not solved the contradiction between 14.22 and 14.23-25, such a reading of 14.20-25 from the bottom has not only interpreted glossolalia to be "wickedness" (14.20) and imperfect, but has inserted 14.20-25 into the first part (14.1-25). Consequently, the reason why St. Paul described

¹⁴⁸ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1128. Also see, M. Robek, Jr., 'The Gift of Prophesying in Acts and Paul,' in *SBeTh* 5 (1975), pp. 39-54.

¹⁴⁹ Johanson, 'Tongues, A Sign for Unbelievers?,' pp. 180-203.

¹⁵⁰ Smit, 'Tongues and Prophecy,' pp. 175-190.

¹⁵¹ Gladstone, 'Sign Language in the Assembly,' p. 186.

¹⁵² Gladstone, 'Sign Language in the Assembly,' p. 185.

prophecy as a gift being limited only to believers, although it was admirable to evangelize unbelievers with prophecy, must be sorted out first.

The first section of the second part (14.20-25) has the structure: head (v. 20) - a (evidence by the law in v. 21) – b (St. Paul’s guiding principle in v. 22) - c (imperfect wisdom in vv.23-25) where v. 20 mentions imperfect wisdom, guilelessness as a prevention against wickedness and perfect wisdom; 14.21-25 deals with the problem caused by the Corinthian imperfect wisdom.

Both children/infants and adults appear in v. 20. In the interpretive scheme of Jewish wisdom tradition pertaining to the triumph of Good over Evil, there are two traditions of children: children in wisdom (imperfect wisdom) described negatively (2 Ki 2.23-24; Prov 7.7; Isa 28.9; Pir Abo 5.27; Mt 14.21; Rom 2.20; 1 Cor 3.1-3; 13.11; Eph 4.14; Heb 2.13f.) and infants in wickedness (guilelessness) described positively (Ps 8.2; Herm. Sim. 9 29.1-3; Mt 11.25; 19.13-15; 1 Pt 2.2). As an antithesis to children in wisdom, we find adults in wisdom (perfect wisdom) (Dan 2.48; 5.11; Wis 9.6; Mt 5.48; Rm 12.2; 1 Cor 2.6; 13.10). On the contrary, there is punishment to the wicked (Rom 1.29-32; 2.9; 1 Cor 5.13; 10.6f.; 2 Cor 5.10). Wickedness designates puffing up; wisdom (φροσίν in 14.20) is the mind of Christ based on ἀγάπη (νοῦν Χριστοῦ in 2.16; cf. τὸ αὐτὸ φρονητε, τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ἔχοντες, σύμψυχοι, τὸ ἐν φρονοῦντες in Phil 2.2; Τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in Phil 2.5), which made the foolish wise (4.10; also see ‘love is not boastful or puffing up’ in 13.4), and guilelessness also indicates humility that becomes weak to the weak (1 Cor 9.15-22; Phil 2.3-8). There is the punishment (κρίμα in 1 Cor 11.29,34; Rom 2.2f.; 3.8; 5.16; also see ῥάβδω in 1 Cor 4.21) of death (θάνατος) to those who hostilely puff themselves up at the table of the Lord (1 Cor 5.6-8; 11.30; Rom 1.28-32)¹⁵³ and a prize (μισθὸν in 3.14; 9.17-19) to those who have perfect wisdom and guilelessness.

¹⁵³ Cf. in 1 Corinthians, the word “death” (θάνατος) has a tendency to be depicted as “perishability” or “rottenness” (15.52-56), since the κέντρον of 15.55-56 was cited from Hos 5.12; and 13.14 (cf. Job 13.28). Therefore, 15.55-56 should be rendered into that “Where, O

14.21 introduces evidence from the law that tongues are a sign to unbelievers since the Lord will speak to this people. The law (Isa 28.11) Paul cited explains wisdom as how to use tongues and lips in Jewish tradition (Job 27.4; Ps 10.7; 12.3,4; 34.13; 120.2; 140.3; Pro 12.19; 17.4; Song of Solomon 4.11; Isa 30.27; 59.3; Eze 3.26; Sirach 22.27; 51.2; 4 Esd 13.10; Rom 3.13; 1 Cor 14.21; cf. 1 Pet 3.10; Jam 3.1-12). It is likely that it reflects either something similar to the Qumran tradition or the kind of tradition evidenced at Qumran (1QH^a 10.18-19; 12.16-17). Weird tongues and lips lead people to convert to folly because of their deceitful deeds. On the contrary sound lips and tongues reveal mysteries and make people bow down in the united assembly (1QH^a 26 *top* 12-16). In this regard, the weak who spoke in tongue with sound would have been treated as inferior and, in that situation, the strong who restrained themselves from speaking in the tongue would have puffed themselves up at the table of the Lord. Thus, St. Paul overturned the way they used to read the law (14.5b). In spite of that, the Jewish wisdom tradition is still valid. Even though weird tongues are described as a gift of the Spirit with which the Lord will speak to this people, there is imperfectness to that gift, in that they will not listen to the Lord, so that they will despise weak believers for unintelligibility of tongues. Among them, some of Jewish unbelievers will misunderstand tongues with sound as foolish.

14.22 relays Paul the Apostle's guiding principle based on the law. How, though should εἰς σημεῖόν εἰσιν be translated? C. Senft points out that 'Tout dépend du sens qu'on attribue à l'obscur εἶναι εἰς σημεῖον.'¹⁵⁴ F. Blass and A. Debrunner say that 'εἰς with the accusative is sometimes used for the predicate accusative as for the predicate nominative. The Semitic influence is unmistakable, although Greek had approximation to this usage.'¹⁵⁵ H. Balz explains that 'εἰμί with dat. can designate a relationship of possession (eg., John 18.39), but also has the meaning *happen to* (Matt 16.22; cf. 18.8; 1 Cor 9.16).'¹⁵⁶ On the other hand F. Blass and A. Debrunner do not read εἰς σημεῖόν εἰσιν of v. 22 in order of εἰς with the accusative and εἰμί with dat.

death, is your victory? Where, O death, is your rottenness?" The rottenness of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law.'

¹⁵⁴ C. Senft, *La Première Épître de Saint Paul Aux Corinthiens* (Lausanne: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1979), p. 179.

¹⁵⁵ *BDF*, pp. 80, 86.

¹⁵⁶ H. Balz, 'εἰμί,' in *EDNT*, vol. 1 (H. Balz and G. Schneider eds.) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1990), pp. 392-393.

but backward of εἶναι εἰς.¹⁵⁷ This reading brings about losing a genitive meaning of εἰμί with dat. so that F. Blass and A. Debrunner render εἶναι εἰς as ‘to serve for.’¹⁵⁸ J. F. M. Smit relies on readings like F. Blass and A. Debrunner¹⁵⁹ and besides, C. K. Barrett does not interpret εἶναι εἰς of 14.22 as the Semitic predicative use. Based on this reading, the English NRSV renders εἰς σημεῖόν εἰσιν as ‘a sign for’ and furthermore, K. O. Sandnes,¹⁶⁰ W. Schrage,¹⁶¹ A. C. Thiselton,¹⁶² and Thomas D’Aquin¹⁶³ also translate it as ‘a sign for.’ On the contrary KJV and some scholars (Jean Héring,¹⁶⁴ D. A. Carson,¹⁶⁵ T. W. Gillespie,¹⁶⁶ and Joop F. M. Smit¹⁶⁷) translate it as ‘a sign to’ and among them, D. A. Carson¹⁶⁸ and T. W. Gillespie¹⁶⁹ interpret a sign to be a negative use of judgment.

However, v. 21 has a linguistic parallel with v. 22, in that the ὥστε of 14.22 connects ‘ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις...λαλήσω with dat. τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ’ in v. 21 to ‘αἱ γλῶσσαι εἰς σημεῖόν εἰσιν with dat. τοῖς ἀπίστοις’ in v. 22. Furthermore, ‘διὰ φαυλισμὸν

¹⁵⁷ BDF, p. 80.

¹⁵⁸ BDF, p. 80.

¹⁵⁹ Smit, ‘Tongues and Prophecy,’ p. 175.

¹⁶⁰ Sandnes, ‘Prophecy- A Sign for Believers (1 Cor 14,20-25),’ pp. 1-15.

¹⁶¹ Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*, p. 376.

¹⁶² Thiselton gives v 22b a different translation ‘So then, tongues serve not as a sign for believers, but as a sign for judgment for unbelievers; while prophetic speech signals not people who do not believe but those who come to faith.’ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1082.

¹⁶³ T. Aquinas, *Commentaire de la Première Épître aux Corinthiens* (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002), p. 438.

¹⁶⁴ Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, p. 151.

¹⁶⁵ D. A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1987), p. 113.

¹⁶⁶ T. W. Gillespie, *The First Theologians: A Study in Early Christian Prophecy* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1994), p. 158.

¹⁶⁷ Smit, ‘Tongues and Prophecy: Deciphering 1 Cor 14,22,’ pp.175-190. He explains 14.22 in the light of *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 14.1431b.2-4 and thus, understands glossolalia as a sign but prophecy as a refutation (ἔλεγχός). In this scheme, he interprets unbelievers as glossolalists and believers as prophets and thus, εἶναι+dat. should not rendered as ‘to be meant for’ but as ‘to belong to, to be proper to.’

¹⁶⁸ Carson, *Showing the Spirit*, p. 113.

¹⁶⁹ Gillespie, *The First Theologians*, pp. 158-160.

χειλέων διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας' of Isa 28.11 LXX has been transformed into 'ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέρων' of 1 Cor 14.21 in the order of word arrangement and the sing. 'γλώσσης ἑτέρας' of Isa 28.11 LXX has been reshaped into the pl. ἑτερογλώσσοις in 1 Cor 14.21 in parallel to the pl. 'γλῶσσαι' of 14.22. Accordingly, the expression 'εἰς σημεῖόν εἰσιν with dat.' should be rendered 'a sign to' with a positive meaning (cf. ἐγένοντο εἰς σημεῖον τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ in Num 17.3 LXX). In this regard, tongues are a sign of redemption to unbelievers through interpretation (14.22,26-28) and prophecy should be spoken to believers in order to be united through weighing not by unbelievers but by believers. In this way, 14.22 is parallel to the second section (14.26-31).

What is more, εἰς σημεῖόν εἰσιν with dat. should not be read as contradictory with Pauline Pneumatology for glossolalia- that tongues speak God's mysteries (the cross and the resurrection) and blessing (14.2,16). Even Isa 28.11-13 says that γλώσσης ἑτέρας giving unintelligible sound speaks about God's repose. Moreover, according to O. Betz, the word σημεῖόν occurs 10 times in the Epistles and is almost always rendered from Heb. נִסִּים.¹⁷⁰ G. H. Twelftree also points out that, in the LXX, 'σημεῖόν is always used of God showing Himself to be the Almighty and Israel to be his chosen people through the events associated with Moses leading the Israelites out of Egypt (e.g., Deut 26.8; Jer 32.20-21; Cf. *Vita Mos* 1.210; *Ant* 2.12.3-2.13.1 §§274-280).¹⁷¹ Consequently, in 1 Cor 14.22, St. Paul provides a paradoxical principle to the Corinthian church that they should use tongues as a sign for the conversion of unbelievers to Christianity.

Even if ἑτερογλώσσοις of 1 Cor 14.21 might reflect the linguistic tension between weird and strong in three *Hodayot* (1QH^a 10.18-19; 12.16-17; 26.12-16), the possible linguistic tension is re-interpreted in which for Paul "strong" means more than intelligible speech. He explains the term 'weird/strange' with Christ centered-

¹⁷⁰ O. Betz, 'σημεῖόν,' *EDNT*, vol. 3 (H. Balz and G. Schneider eds) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1993), pp. 238-239.

¹⁷¹ G. H. Twelftree, 'Signs, Wonders, Miracles,' *DPHL* (G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin, and D.G. Reid eds) (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1993), p. 875.

monistic universalism rather than with the dualism of wisdom and evil. The Christ centered-monistic wisdom, in which foolishness is not put as an opposite to wisdom so that a boundary between weird tongues and strong tongues becomes indistinct (1.26-28; 4.10; 6.7-11), the same as social boundaries have fallen down in Christ (1 Cor 12.13; Gal 3.28). Thus, in the body of Christ, God has composed weird tongues and placed as a member indispensable (12.18-24). As for St. Paul, perfect (strong) wisdom is to form one body in Christ through clothing the inferior member with honour. In the monistic wisdom, St. Paul re-describes evil as puffing up which is opposed to Christ-centered perfect wisdom. In divisions of the Corinthian church, it was not a conflict between a great duty and foolishness, rather a conflict between two strong wisdoms. It was evil that strong believers did not sympathize with Pauline strong wisdom in Christ, where not only has the perfect wisdom of v.20 been connected to weird tongues of v. 21, but also overturned their strong wisdom so that tongues became a sign not to believers but to unbelievers, while prophecy became a sign not to unbelievers but to believers.

Vv. 23-25 are contradictory to v. 22; as such, most scholars choose to read 14.20-25 from the bottom. For that reason, v. 22 has been regarded as St. Paul's logical mistake. As shown above, however, v. 22 shows parallels not only to v. 21 and but to the second section (vv. 26-31) in which v. 22 becomes perfect through interpretation for tongues and judgment for prophecy. Furthermore, vv. 23-25 are opposed to the second section as well as v. 22. In this regard, it makes best sense to read the first section in regular order rather than from the bottom.

Ἐὰν in vv. 23,24 (also see. vv. 6,7,8,9,11,14,16) reflects Paul the Apostle's worry over imperfect wisdom of the Corinthians who inappropriately used the gifts of the Spirit. Their application of the gifts that all speak in tongues and all prophesy is in conflict with St. Paul's guiding principle that two or at the most three believers speak in tongues and speak prophecy at once. Vv. 23-25 point out a contrary effect the Corinthians might bring about, if all speak in tongues and all prophesy.

In what sense, though, does it have an adverse effect? St. Paul worried that in case of non-participation of interpretation and judgment by fellow believers (as to the problem of the participation of fellow believers in the table of the Lord, see. 6.4; 9.23; 10.17; 11.17-22), unbelievers and catechumens would judge the gifts spoken by the Corinthian believers. In this situation of divisions within the church, puffing up of strong believers was described as wickedness (5.6-8; 14.20; cf. 11.17). Without interpretation, catechumens and unbelievers, who had no knowledge of the gospel would misjudge tongues to be μαίνεσθε.

St. Paul says that ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος who wears only the image of the earthy does not accept 'the things of Spirit of God' (τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ) which were granted freely by God as a favour to believers (2.12-14; 15.47-49). The Corinthians were depicted as God's field at the level of the ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος, or of children who do not fully understand τὰ πνευματικά St. Paul has sown in (3.1-3; 9.11; 14.20). Thus, it is likely that the Corinthian practice of using prophecy should have come into question; namely, their prophecy should have been subject to fellow believers, probably because prophetesses, at least some of them, might have received the educational benefits of γνῶσις (8.7; 13.2) puffing up themselves in St. Paul's absence from Corinth and awarding more honour to unbelievers with γνῶσις than weak believers without γνῶσις. Even if the women prophets surpassed others in speech skill and γνῶσις, and γνῶσις belonged to τὰ πνευματικά (12.8; 14.1,6), and they consider themselves superior witnesses of Christ, they have still neglected Paul's Christ centered, ἀγάπη centered ecclesiology. As such, the Corinthian prophets as well as tongues-speakers would have had imperfect wisdom of τὰ πνευματικά the Apostle Paul has sown in.

Nevertheless, the expression πεσῶν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον προσκυνήσει τῷ θεῷ in 14.25 always appears as positive in Jewish tradition. In this situation, not only did most of the Corinthians reach the level of children toward γνῶσις as well as τὰ πνευματικά (3.1-3; 8.8-13; 14.20), but they had no one wise enough to judge between two fellow believers (6.5). If unbelievers and catechumens with Jewish γνῶσις judged believers' prophecy and recognized the best among them, and then, bestowed honour on them

with deep admiration ('God is really among you'), the Corinthians would have derived benefit. This would not only be from identifying the God who would be disclosed through Christian γνῶσις with the God of Jewish γνῶσις, but from learning the depth of the riches of the γνῶσις of God. As such, the Corinthian church would have been able to gain official approval by Jewish wise men (refer to ἀπαγγέλλων in 14.25) as a stepping-stone for sound communication with the world. However, that God is disclosed through judgment by unbelievers, should have been suppressed and, furthermore, in the situation of divisions and the Corinthians' childish level of ἀγάπη, weak believers would be treated as inferior and it would obstruct them in the bestowment of honour as a fellow partaker. The honorable judgment that 'God is really among you' should have been able to be given to weak believers by fellow believers for building up the church with ἀγάπη (12.24).

The Corinthians wanted to be judged by unbelievers and catechumens, when the righteous would enter the church, so that they had an unusual public worship where all spoke in tongues and all prophesied. The worship looked to form one body in Christ, but they have been divided and puffed up. Each of them had no true believing friend who sat by and would approve a fellow believer's moral innocence to take part in the table of the Lord together. In this chaos, St. Paul deplored the absence of interpretation and of weighing what is said.

Consequently, reading 14.20-25 in regular order suggests including the text in the second part (14.20-38), rather than in the first part (14.1-25) and considering 14.22 as the most significant verse rather than as Paul's logical mistake. In distinction from the first part, this section (14.20-25) in the second part (14.20-38) details the wise and faithful application of gifts lest the weak are despised and manipulated by the strong but rather the weak marginalized are guaranteed the equal authority to speak in faithful fellowship.

3.3.2.2. Perfect wisdom: interpretation of tongues and discernment of prophecy (14.26-31)

G. D. Fee locates vv. 32-33 in final the admonition of his second part's first section (vv. 26-33)¹⁷² and understands disorder (ἀκαταστασίας) as a vice caused by unintelligible speech.¹⁷³ However, as explained before, this interpretation remains contradictory to v. 22. A. C. Thiselton rightly points out that disorder reflects jealousy and strife caused by a self-contradictory and chaotic lifestyle in the matter of delivering the word of God (vv. 28-32).¹⁷⁴ Nevertheless, he also did not find vv. 32-33 to be a head of our second part's the third section.

The second section (14.26-31) has the structure: head (v. 26) – a (v. 27) – b (v.28a) – c (v. 28b) – a (v. 29) – b (v. 30) – c (v. 31). Pauline perfect wisdom is explained as the application of the gifts of the Spirit for believers' unity. The opening question 'Τί οὖν ἔστιν, ἀδελφοί;' (So what shall I do, my dear friends?) in v. 26a draws the readers' attention to the problem raised by the Corinthian foolishness- when they come together in the same place, if all speak in tongues, none of believers can interpret them and if all prophesy, none of believers can judge them. V. 26b outlines the entire section (vv. 26-31). The phrase of 'ἕκαστος...ἔχει' (each one has) demonstrates plainly the proper use of gifts (12.18; 14.40) in opposition to the Corinthian foolish use of gifts. The word 'ἕκαστος' of v. 26 is connected to δύο ἢ τρεῖς in vv. 27,29. All the Corinthians should have learned to praise God who is stronger than themselves (10.22; 14.31). The expression 'ὅταν συνέρχησθε...πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γινέσθω' indicates that all the gifts are for believers' unity, in which all the gifts should be applied for building up the church with ἀγάπη. An item of teaching and a tongue must be used in humility not for seeking their own. The reason why St. Paul lists an item of teaching, something disclosed, a tongue, and interpretation is explained in two (b) (vv. 28a,30). An item of teaching should yield room to 'something disclosed' and be silent (v. 30) for an antimonopoly policy (ὁ θεὸς συνεκέρασεν τὸ σῶμα in 12.24; 14.31). A tongue should yield room to intelligible speech and be silent, if there is no interpretation (v. 28a), in order not to put an obstacle in the way of the gospel

¹⁷² Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 689.

¹⁷³ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 697.

¹⁷⁴ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1145-1146.

of Christ which saves unbelievers (9.12,22; 14.22). Humility which is practiced as being silent in the church makes possible the participation of all the Corinthians in one body (vv. 28,30,34).

Two (a) (vv. 27,29) list two duets: a duet of a tongue and interpretation and another duet of prophecy and weighing what is said. It is through these duets St. Paul tried to sort out a major problem of the Corinthian church relating to the application of gifts, caused by which within the assembly, there was no wise one to explain what is said for building up the church at a fellow believer's side (cf. 6.5). The two (a) (vv. 27,29) make St. Paul's guiding principle of 14.22 perfect. The conversion of unbelievers to Christianity and sound communication between the church and the world are possible by both interpretation of a tongue and weighing prophecy. Tongues should be interpreted by one believer so speakers with glossolalia can be equal to prophets; prophecy should be able to be weighed by all fellow believers so weak believers can be equalized with strong believers not through γνῶσις (8.1 says that 'γνῶσις puffs up') but through Pauline strong wisdom in Christ (φρῆν in 4.10; 14.20).

Two (b) (vv. 28a,30) state about silence based on ἀγάπη that speakers with glossolalia and prophets grant a concession to profit others (13.5 says that 'ἀγάπη does not insist on its own way'). The virtue of concession should be practiced of their own will in order to profit the body of Christ (6.7; 9.12; 12.24). The reason for the mention of something disclosed and interpretation in the two (b) is for giving an instruction of the perfect application of a tongue and prophecy. Speakers with glossolalia should learn to be silent, when there is no an interpreter, in order not to put an obstacle in the way of the gospel of Christ (9.12; 14.22-23). Even though they speak the mysteries of God (the cross and the resurrection) in tongues, and the law states that the Lord will speak with weird tongues to this people, through self-control they do not make full use of their rights in the gospel. This helps unbelievers to partake in the gospel so that the church will increase (9.18-22). Regarding prophecy, the gift looks omnipotent as compared to glossolalia. However, a serious problem within the situation of divisions is to be prophets' monopolistic puffing up in favour of one against another (4.6; 5.6-8; 14.36). Thus, the Apostle explains that

they should learn to make a concession with modesty to make the body equal, when something is disclosed to another person who is sitting down (12.24; also see 6.7; 8.13). Accordingly, being silent in the church is the practice of the voluntary humility for the profit of the body of Christ.

2 (c) (vv. 28b,31) describes the original application of a tongue and prophecy that is beneficial to believers. Speakers with tongues say a blessing of God to themselves (14.16) and the prayer and praise of thanksgiving to God (14.15-17). All the Corinthians can be a prophet/prophetess and they can teach and encourage each other and in this way, the church will be built up with ἀγάπη.

3.3.2.3. Paul the Apostle's warning to the Corinthian prophetesses' puffing up (14.32-38)

A. C. Wire categorizes the view of scholars on vv. 34-35 into three.¹⁷⁵ Firstly, the verses reflect Paul the Apostle's answer to the Corinthian women's claim for a right to speak. According to Wire, H. A. W. Meyer (in 1839) concluded that "Regarding gifts of the Spirit... Corinthian women, with their freer mood inclined towards emancipation, must have presumed on this... Paul is decided against all undue exaltation and assumption on the part of women in religious things, and it has been the occasion of much evil in the church."¹⁷⁶ According to the second theory supported by many researchers, St. Paul did not conceive a plan for the Corinthian women's silence. 'Since he had already instructed women to cover their heads when praying and prophesying (11.5), he can only be restricting women in other roles, in other kinds of meetings, or women of another marriage status.'¹⁷⁷ The third view postulates that the Apostle Paul did not write vv. 34-35 but it is 'a later interpolation.'

¹⁷⁵ Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, pp. 229-232.

¹⁷⁶ Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, p. 229. Also see. H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians* (New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890) (from 5th German ed., 1870), pp. 333-335.

¹⁷⁷ Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, pp. 229.

However, the third view is opposed by A. C. Wire raising two questions to G. Dautzenberg¹⁷⁸ who supports so called 'the extended interpolation theory' which is 'reflected in the paragraph structure given the Nestle-Aland 26th edition of the Greek New Testament.'¹⁷⁹ C.-W. Yoon also points out that the verses are included in all the manuscripts, but some manuscripts (D, F, G, Old Latin manuscripts and Ambrosiaster Sedulius Scotus) relocate the verses to follow v. 40.¹⁸⁰

All these theories are based on a conflict between 11.5 and 14.34-35. If 11.4 says that a man with a head-covering is not permitted to pray or prophesy, because he who prays or prophesies with something on his head disgraces his head, 11.5 is read as follows: if a women who ought to have a head-covering prays or prophesies uncovered, it disgraces her head. That is to say, in 11.4-5, the direct reason why one disgraces one's head is not praying or prophesying but, a problem as to a head-covering. Therefore, it is likely that, in relation to a head-covering, Paul the Apostle's argument as to women's disgrace in ch. 11 is linked to the women's silence in ch. 14. However, in what sense were the Corinthian women who were restricted in speaking in the church allowed to speak in the church, as long as they put a head-covering? If they were baptized Christians, for what reason were restrictions on the right to speak imposed upon the prophetesses?

Apart from the debate as to whether 11.5 is contradictory to 14.34-35, this thesis would presuppose that there probably were various groups of women in the church, but it argues that vv. 34-35 might be the injunction given to those who disregarded Pauline wisdom of ἀγάπη and τὰ πνευματικά. Since St. Paul, in his absence from Corinth, heard that the yeast of boasting had been leavening the whole church, he

¹⁷⁸ Refer to G. Dautzenberg, *Urchristliche Prophetie, ihre Erforschung, ihre Voraussetzungen im Judentum und ihre Struktur im ersten Korintherbrief* (Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, and Mainz: Kohlhammer, 1975), pp. 257-274, 290-300.

¹⁷⁹ Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, pp. 230-231.

¹⁸⁰ C.-W. Yoon, *고린도전서 다시 읽기* (한국성서학연구소, 2011), p. 270. Also, see. B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), pp. 499-500.

would have ordered silence to a lot of the unspecified Corinthian Christian women as a pastoral directive for taking care of the most urgent problem.

Furthermore, similarly to that of the first section (vv. 20-25), the third section (14.32-36) has a structure of head (vv. 32-33) – a (evidence by the law in v. 34) – b (St. Paul's directive in v. 35) – c (wicked puffing up in v. 36) – conc (vv. 37-38). As explained before, most inserted 14.20-25 in the first part so that they did not realize that v. 20 is the head of the second part in which evil as opposed to wisdom (φροσύνη) indicates prophetesses' being puffed up. Furthermore, they did not find an appropriate explanation of 14.34-36. However, this essay places vv. 32-33 at the head of the third section of the second part, since evil mentioned in the head of the second part (v. 20) becomes a main theme in the third section and disorder corresponds to evil (vv. 32-38) rather than perfect wisdom (vv. 26-31).

The head (vv. 32-33) consists of one sentence in which two verses are inter-connected through γάρ, a coordinating conjunction. It says about 'subordination' (ὑποτάσσω in vv. 32,34; 15.27-28; 16.16; Rom 13.1-7). The whole congregation attains equality in Christ but the order of the church guarantees the equality only to those who are in a new batch introduced by Paul the Apostle (5.7). ψυχικός prophets or puffed up prophets who do not accept the ethics of τὰ πνευματικά the Apostle Paul taught should be obedient to fellow believing prophets whose spirits are untied to Christ and capable of judging all things (2.11-15; 6.17). This is the case in all the churches of the saints ('Christ is the head of every man, the husband is the head of his wife, and God is the head of Christ.' in 11:3); also, refer to the omission of equality between men and women in the baptismal formula of 12.13 by comparison with Gal 3.28.¹⁸¹ It is likely that the yeast of boasting has leavened the whole assembly centering among women prophets.

¹⁸¹ According to Wire, the reason why St. Paul objected to the authority of the Corinthian prophetesses, is that he did not accept it was God's spirit the Corinthian women prophets had received and through the spirits they were unduly exalted in the church. *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, pp. 181-196.

V. 33 has an antithesis between disorder (ἀκαταστασίας) and peace (εἰρήνης), just as evil is antithetical to wisdom in the head of the second part (v. 20). The expression 'The God of peace' (Ο θεός (τῆς) εἰρήνης) is found in 14.33; 2 Cor 13.11; Rom 15.33; 16.20; Phi 4.9; 1 Thess 5.23. It delineates God as who is with His believing saints ('ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν' in 2 Cor 13.11; Phi 4.9; cf. Gen 48.21; Amos 5.14 and μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν in Rom 15:33; 1 Cor 16.24; 2 Cor 13.13; cf. 2 Thess 3.16). The word 'disorder' denotes the preposterous application of prophecy by which believers' prophecy was not weighed by fellow believers, but rather by unbelievers. On the contrary, the God of peace who called saints into the fellowship of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, is faithful, not through unbelievers but through believers (1.3,9; 7.15; 14.22,29; cf. 6.1f.).

A case is the point at issue in the body of the third section (vv. 34- 36). The Apostle Paul declares that 'women should remain silent in the churches.' Vv. 34b-35 show linguistic coherence with the dative case (αὐταῖς in v. 34 and γυναικί in v. 35.), as do vv. 21-22 (τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ in v. 21 and οὐ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπίστοις in v. 22). It is through presenting the law in 14.34 that he finds justification for why women should remain silent in the churches and speaking in the church is shameful to women. St. Paul issues a pastoral directive based on the law in v. 35, as does he in v. 22. He raises a question in v. 36 in which their wicked boasting comes into question.

Wire suggests reading the concluding verse (vv. 37-38) as a conditional-warning curse: 'Whoever does not recognize this, God does not recognize'.¹⁸² The Apostle Paul, providing himself an example, shows the doctrine of triumph over death in Christ in Romans 7-8. 'So I find it to be a law that when I want to do what is good, evil lies close at hand' (7.21). 'Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord!...There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus, for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set you free from the law of sin and of death' (7.25-8.2). Similarly, in 1 Corinthians, St. Paul, setting himself on the table for the strong group along with prophetesses, gives a warning to the strong; as a

¹⁸² Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, p. 155.

prophet and person of the Spirit they will be 'not proven to stand the test' (ἀδόκιμος in 1 Cor 9.27; 2 Cor 13.5-7; Rom 1.28; ἀγνοεῖτω in 1 Cor 14.38), unless they understand the Lord's command and do exercise self-control in everything. In the whole Pauline scheme of good and evil, judgment of death or curses will be conquered in Christ on the Last Day (1 Cor 15.50-58). Nonetheless, the tensions between a blessing and a curse still are effective in Christian ethics, for the purpose of inspiring them to do what is right ('ἀλλ' ἵνα ὑμεῖς τὸ καλὸν ποιῆτε' in 2 Cor 13.7). In this, the law will play an important part in building up traditions for God's building (1 Cor 9.8-9; 14.21,34; also see. 11.2). In this regard, 14.37-38 can be understood as a conditional warning to those who are damaging the body of Christ.

3.3.3. Conclusive admonition (14.39-40)

The expression Ὡστε, ἀδελφοί [μου] of 14.39 (also see. 11.33; 15.58) emphasizes the meaning of *faithful friendship for God's work* in the 5th part (5. Faithful friendship for God's work in 11.2-15.58) in order that God's church might not be blamed but rather be strong through faithful friendship (also refer to 1.8-9). It also points out vv. 39-40 are a concluding clause.

The phrase ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε in 14.1 is re-expressed as ζηλοῦτε τὸ προφητεύειν in 14.39. Both prophecy and tongues belong under τὰ πνευματικά, in which the former is greater than the latter. All the gifts of the Spirit should be *properly* (εὐσχημόνως) practiced. It would be wrong that the gifts are used in the way that strong believers win honour and weak believers' morality is dishonored (14.23-25; cf. 12.22-24), as all speak in tongues and all prophesy at the same time (14.23-25 in opposition to 12.22-24; regarding St. Paul's warning of uniformity implied in *all*, refer to 12.17,29-30).

The expression καθ' ὑπερβολήν of 12.31 is re-expressed as κατὰ τάξιν in 14.40 (also see. κατὰ δύο ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τρεῖς καὶ ἀνὰ μέρος, καὶ εἰς διερμηνευέτω in 14.27). Varieties of gifts were sown in God's field at Corinth by St. Paul, but they need to

keep in mind that there is a pecking order among gifts. Prophecy is greater than tongues (12.10,28,29-30; 14.1-19). However, what is more important is that they should practice gifts in the way that two or three speak in order to build up the church based on ἀγάπη and *faithfulness*, rather than all speak simultaneously (14.26-31).

The Apostle Paul exercises strict control over the Corinthian prophetesses' speaking (being silent) and action (submission) in the church (14.32-38). According to *the order* established to secure weak believer's equal treatment in Christ, Paul the Apostle strongly exhorts the women prophets to learn to humble themselves on account of Christ (refer to διὰ Χριστόν in 4.10; also see. Phi 2.8).

3.4. Conclusion

The purpose of the current study was to determine reading 1 Cor 14.20-25 in regular order along with an explanation of two scenarios of tongue in ch. 14. Nonetheless, there are three advantages of the existing consensus 'bottom up' way of reading 14.20-25. This reading includes the text in the first part (14.1-25) for which three satisfactory explanations might be possible.

a. Prophecy is superior to tongue

Reading 14.20-25 from the bottom within the first part (14.1-25) interprets 14.20-22 on the basis of 14.23-25 in which Paul the Apostle's gist is the intelligible gift's superiority over the unintelligible gift. Intelligible prophecy is a greater gift for building up the church than tongue in that it is useful for unbelievers'

Christianization (14.24-25). Although this reading has inconsistency between 14.22b and 14.24-25, it explains well Paul's argument within the first part (14.1-25).

- b. A negative interpretation of the Greek $\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ of 14.23 in case of tongue with sound

As the Corinthian believers apply tongue as a sign to unbelievers (14.22), unbelievers will not listen to what believers spoke (14.2,21). The Greek $\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ will be interpreted with a negative meaning. According to this interpretive scheme, Paul the Apostle presents grounds for the reason that unbelievers would not listen to their tongues in 14.21; this emphasizes the mystery of the gospel spoken with tongue in 14.22 and then, in 14.23 he shows the result. The term $\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ of 14.23 will be interpreted negatively due to the gift's unintelligibility.

- c. A positive interpretation of the Greek $\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ of 14.23 in case of silent tongue

Silent tongue-speakers speak the mysteries of the depths of God and the higher level of Christianized $\gamma\nu\omega\acute{\omicron}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ with $\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\nu$ sound (2.10; 13.1; 14.8-10). In accordance with this interpretive design, Paul the Apostle says the reason for the inappropriateness of tongue with sound citing the law in 14.21. On the contrary in 14.22-23, he shows the usefulness of silent tongue for the evangelization of unbelievers. As the Corinthian church speaks in tongue in silence, at least some well-educated Jewish unbelievers will respond to it by saying 'you are inspired' ($\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$) and be step by step concerned about the mysteries of Christianity spoken with silent tongue, even if less-educated unbelievers might respond to the gift with a negative attitude.

However, this thesis has suggested reading 14.20-25 in regular order. The findings of this research yield a couple of noteworthy advantages of an alternative way of reading 14.20-25.

a. A negative meaning of μαίνεσθε of 14.23 in case of tongue with sound

Reading 14.20-25 in regular order, there appears a linguistic coherence between 14.21-22 ('to this people' in 14.21 and 'to unbelievers' in 14.22) through a subordinating conjunction ὥστε in 14.22. Paul the Apostle's argument in 14.22 is consistent with 14.26-31(38) in which 14.23-25 is found to be contradictory both to 14.21-22 and 14.26f. According to this interpretive criterion based on the alternative structure, in 14.21 Paul the Apostle presents the law as direct evidence to show that what is spoken by believers should be judged by fellow believers. Correspondingly, 14.22 is explained as his declaration on how to use gifts. In this regard, 14.23 will be revealed as a case of the wrong application of tongue. In the case that the Corinthian church spoke in tongue with sound, the Greek μαίνεσθε will be interpreted as negative due to its unintelligibility.

b. Duplicity of a meaning of μαίνεσθε of 14.23 in case of tongue in silence

St. Paul changes the singular noun of tongue in Isa 28.11 LXX and two *Hodayot* (1QH^a 10.7,18-19; 12.16-17) into the plural noun of ἑτερογλώσσοις in 1 Cor 14.21 in which varieties of tongues can be included, even if the Corinthian silent tongue is different from tongue with sound implied in the two kinds of laws. As the whole Corinthian church speaks in silent tongue, the interpretation of the Greek μαίνεσθε can be divided into two according to the education level of unbelievers: a positive response by well-educated Jewish unbelievers and a negative response by less-educated Jewish unbelievers.

c. The Corinthians' wrong application of prophecy in 14.24-25

The expression τῶ λαῶ τούτῳ of 14.21 is connected not only to αἱ γλῶσσαι ... τοῖς ἀπίστοις but to ἡ προφητεία ... τοῖς πιστεύουσιν through ὥστε in 14.22, which is

parallel to 14.29-31. With reference to prophecy, therefore, in this alternative reading of 14.20-25, 14.22 is disclosed as Paul the Apostle's guiding principle on how to use the gift. Along with 14.23, 14.24-25 is found to be a case of the incorrect application of prophecy. Within the enlarged structure of 14.20-38, 14.24-25 can be read as Paul's pointing out the abuse of prophecy by prophetesses puffed up.

In conclusion, reading 14.20-25 bottom up puts the text in the first part (14.1-25) in which St. Paul's gist in 14.20-25 is explained as prophecy's superiority to tongue. However, this reading is rather disappointing, because there remains a contradiction between 14.22b and 14.24-25 and for this reading, 14.22b will have to be considered as Paul the Apostle's logical mistake.

On the contrary reading 14.20-25 in regular order includes the text in the second part (14.20-38) in which not only does 14.20 play of a part of the head and 14.37-38 becomes a conclusion, but also 14.23-25 is surrounded by the parallelism between 14.21-22 and 14.26-31(38). In this alternative reading of 14.20-25 within the enlarged structure, Paul the Apostle's argument is revealed as the wise application of tongues and prophecy to take care of weak believers, no matter how the Greek *μαίνεσθε* of 14.23 is interpreted within the two scenarios of tongue. In this alternative interpretive scheme, the first part (14.1-19) relays the reasonable application of gifts based on *γνῶσις* (14.6), while the second part remarks on the wise application of gifts on the basis of *φρεσίν* by which the strong become weak on account of Christ and the weak become strong in Christ (4.10; 14.20).

4. A possible scenario of silent tongue in 1 Cor 14.10 (ἄφωνον) and *speaking into air* in 14.9 as Paul the Apostle's worry

Previously scholars have argued that 1 Cor 14.8-11 was about glossolalia with sound, but I am going to argue for another interpretive possibility. I propose that scholars must decide whether the texts provide an explanation of either noisy tongue or silent glossolalia. There is textual evidence for the possibility of silent tongue: a comparison of 14.2 with Philo, *Heres* 14-16 and the literal translation of ἄφωνος in 14.10 into silent; A comparison of ἄφωνον in 1 Cor 14.10 with ἄφωνος in Quod Det 1.191; Mut 1.64; Cher 1.93; and Congr 1.150. This evidence supports an alternative interpretation that 1 Cor 14 speaks about glossolalia in silence for the following reasons.

Firstly, 14.10 shows a linguistic antithesis between the plural φωνῶν and sing. ἄφωνον in relation to sound. As well as the Greek φωνή, ἄφωνος is never translated in relation to *meaning* elsewhere but this text. Recently, however, NRSV translates the Greek ἄφωνον as '(nothing is) without sound.' What is more, previous rendering of the Greek ἄφωνον into *meaningless* is illogical in that there is evidence for speech without meaning in Jewish world (see. 1 Sam 10).

In accordance with the evidence, translating the word δύναμιν as *meaning* is a free translation based on the logical leap in 14.10, even though the Greek δύναμις has a great semantic range. There is evidence for the understanding of *meaning* in Greek literature (Plato *Cra.* 394b; Herm *Vis.* iii.4.3; *Dial.* 125.1).¹⁸³

Secondly, not only is ἄφωνον in 1 Cor 14.10 worth comparing with the Greek σιγήσετε in *Heres* 14 where σιγήσετε designates philosophical silent speech, but 1

¹⁸³ Regarding the reference in Greek literature, see. *EDNT*, vol. 1, p. 356.

Cor 14.2 is analogous to *Heres* 14 ('by the all-instructed and very loudly speaking organ of that voice of which no mortal man is the hearer, but only the uncreated and immortal God'). Even if the Corinthian glossolalia described by St. Paul has a silent characteristic, it would show divine speech in silence Christianized from Philo.

Lastly, the evidence presented thus far might provide readers with a more dramatic and concrete reading into the two dimensional understanding in Jewish and Greek tradition for the expression *speaking into air* of 14.9 and *a barbarian*¹⁸⁴ of 14.11. In other words, if we interpret the Greek γλώσση, γλῶσσαι, γλώσσαις or γλῶσσαν as indicating nothing but glossolalia with sound, we will be confused about the reason that a Jew or a God-fearer or a Jewish Christian responded to unintelligible tongue(s) with *speaking into air* in a negative sense. Such a response seems to be contradictory to their knowledge of unintelligible prophetic utterance (1 Sam 10). Consequently, it is more likely that two types of tongue-speaking are at issue in 1 Cor. 14, and not simply one audible form of the phenomenon.

4.1. Philosophical speech with sound and in silence in the Hellenistic-Jewish world

4.1.1. Philosophical speech with sound and in silence in Philo

Jewish tradition initiates us into angelic languages which can be divided into two: an intelligible language and unintelligible languages. Recently, J. C. Poirier in his book, *The Tongues of Angels*, grouped angelic languages into two classes in Jewish tradition:

¹⁸⁴ It is not likely that the weak responded to the silent tongue spoken by the strong as barbarians. For more information as to one of the potential responses to the silent tongue as barbarian by Gentile unbelievers, see. Ch. 6.

Hebrew and the esoteric heavenly language.¹⁸⁵ However, angelic unintelligible languages should be divided into two as well: esoteric heavenly language and angelic silent language. In the writings of St. Paul's contemporaries, there is silent speech in both the Jewish and Graeco-Roman world.

Philo, the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher, explains that silent speech is perceptible only by God, intellect and an 'invisible musician'.

Heres 14-16 says that:

¹⁴ Silence (ἡσυχία), then, is a desirable thing for those who are ignorant, but for those who desire knowledge, and who have at the same time a love for their master's freedom of speech, is a most necessary possession. Accordingly it is said, in the book of Exodus, "The Lord will fight for us, and you will be silent (σιγήσετε)." [Exodus xiv. 4.] And, immediately afterwards, there is added a scripture in the following words: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Why dost thou cry unto me?" As it is proper for those persons to be silent who can say nothing worthy of being listened to, and for those to speak who, through love of wisdom, believe in God; and not only to speak quietly but to cry out with exceeding noise, not indeed with the noise of the mouth and tongue, by means of which they say that the air is affected with a rotatory motion, and so is rendered capable of being perceived by the hearing, but by the all-instructed and very loudly speaking organ of that voice of which no mortal man is the hearer, but only the uncreated and immortal God;

¹⁵ For the well-arranged and carefully attuned melody of that harmony which is perceptible by the intellect, the invisible musician,

¹⁸⁵ J. C. Poirier, *The Tongues of Angels: The Concept of Angelic Languages in Classical Jewish and Christian Texts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), throughout.

perceptible by the intellect, is alone able to comprehend; but no one of those involved in the entanglements of the outward senses can appreciate it. Accordingly, when the entire organ of the mind sounds according to the symphony of the diapason and of the double diapason, the hearer, as it were, asks (for he does not ask in reality, since everything is known to God), "Why dost thou cry unto me?" Is it in supplication that evils may be averted, or in thankfulness for a participation in good things which have been already enjoyed, or for a combination of both reasons?;¹⁶ But the man who appears to be endued with a thin voice, and with slowness of speech, and to be almost dumb, is nevertheless found to be talkative, so that in one place he is represented not merely as speaking, but even as crying out; and, in another, as exerting a ceaseless and uninterrupted flow of words;¹⁸⁶

Recently, David T. Runia reviewed Anna Pawlaczyk's short article in 2000 on silence in *Heres*¹⁸⁷ and commented that the silent speech in Philo followed the tradition of Plato that 'Although Philo is not the first author writing in Greek to place speech and silence on an equal footing- this honour must go to Plato-, he is certainly very aware of the role of silence in relation to speech and the various forms that such silence can take. The article briefly analyses the kinds of silence in relation to speech that occur in Philo's treatise *Her*.'¹⁸⁸

In addition to that, *Heres* 249 describes prophetic madness and among this phenomenon, come a description of silence.

¹⁸⁶ Also refer to *Heres* 266; *Quod Det* 102; *Sacr* 60.

¹⁸⁷ A. Pawlaczyk, 'The Motif of Silence in Philo's of Alexandria Treatise "Quis rerum divinarum heres sit" some remarks, *PJBR* (2000), pp. 127-131.

¹⁸⁸ D. T. Runia (ed), *Philo of Alexandria: An Annotated Bibliography 1997-2006* (Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands, 2012), pp. 147-148.

And about the setting of the sun a trance fell upon Abraham, and, behold, fear with great darkness fell upon him." [Genesis xv. 12.] Now there is one kind of trance which is a sort of frantic delirium, causing infirmity of mind, either through old age, or melancholy, or some other similar cause. There is another kind which is excessive consternation, arising usually from things which happen suddenly and unexpectedly. Another kind is mere tranquility of the mind, arising when it is inclined by nature to be quiet (ἡσυχάζειν): but that which is the best description of all is a divinely inspired and more vehement sort of enthusiasm, which the race of prophets is subject to.

On the basis of M. Harl's translation, T. Alekniené classifies ecstasy delineated in *Heres* 249 into four.

Philon note que le mot grec ἔκστασις peut avoir quatre significations différentes. Il explique que "'Extase' signifie tantôt (1) la fureur délirante qui provoque la folie, sous l'effet de la sénilité, ou de la mélancolie, ou pour tout autre raison analogue; tantôt (2) la stupéfaction qu'on éprouve devant des événements survenant à l'improviste, alors que l'on ne s'y attend pas; tantôt encore (3) le calme (ἡρεμία) de l'intelligence (διάνοια), si vraiment il est dans sa nature de se reposer parfois; tantôt enfin, (4) ce qui est le mieux, la possession et le délire d'origine divine, comme l'éprouve la race prophétique (ἡ δὲ πασῶν ἀρίστη ἔνθεος κατοκωχή τε καὶ μανία)".¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁹ T. Alekniené, 'L'"Extase Mystique" dans la Tradition Platonicienne: Philon D'Alexandrie et Plotin,' in *SPA* 22 (2010), p. 59.

T. Alekniéné defines the ecstasy accompanied with an afternoon nap, not as the intervention of rationality or magic or mystique, but rather as ‘un état de “l’obsession temporaire’ ou ce qu’on appelle aujourd’hui une transe médiumnique’¹⁹⁰ to which an analogy was probably known by Plotinus (see. Tr. 9 [VI, 9]) who was one of the Neoplatonists.¹⁹¹

Philo in *Heres* 253-266 also describes both prophetic madness and philosophical-audible speech.

²⁶³Very admirably, therefore, does the historian here point out, that Abraham was under the influence of inspiration when he says that, "About the setting of the sun a trance fell upon him."... ²⁶⁴As long therefore as our mind still shines around and hovers around, pouring as it were a noontide light into the whole soul, we, being masters of ourselves, are not possessed by any extraneous influence; but when it approaches its setting, then, as is natural, a trance, which proceeds from inspiration, takes violent hold of us, and madness seizes upon us, for when the divine light shines the human light sets, and when the divine light sets this other rises and shines;... ²⁶⁵and this very frequently happens to the race of prophets; for the mind that is in us is removed from its place at the arrival of the divine Spirit, but is again restored to its previous habitation when that Spirit departs, for it is contrary to holy law for what is mortal to dwell with what is immortal. On this account the setting of our reason, and the darkness which surrounds it, causes a trance and a heaven-inflicted madness; ²⁶⁶After that the historian connects

¹⁹⁰ Alekniéné, ‘L’"Extase Mystique" dans la Tradition Platonicienne: Philon D’Alexandrie et Plotin,’ pp. 64-65.

¹⁹¹ Alekniéné, ‘L’"Extase Mystique" dans la Tradition Platonicienne: Philon D’Alexandrie et Plotin,’ throughout. As for a recent research on philosophic speech in silence in Platonic, see. N. Banner, *The Power of the Said: Philosophic Silence in Plotinus* (a PhD dissertation; Exeter: the University of Exeter, 2013).

with his preceding account what follows in consistency with it, saying, "And it was said to Abraham"—for in real truth the prophet, even when he appears to be speaking, is silent and another being is employing his vocal organs, his mouth and tongue, for the explanation of what things he chooses; and operating on these organs by some invisible and very skilful act, he makes them utter a sweet and harmonious sound, full of every kind of melody.

Quod Det 1.91-92 says that:

⁹¹Let this then be enough to say concisely about the essence of the soul. And now proceeding in regular order, we will explain the expression, that "the voice of his blood cries out," in this manner,—of our soul, one part is dumb, and one part is endowed with utterance. All that part which is devoid of reason is likewise destitute of voice, but all that part which is rational is capable of speech, and that part alone has formed any conception of God; for, by the other parts of us, we are not able to comprehend God, or any other object of the intellect; ⁹²Of our vivifying power, therefore, of which the blood is, as it were, the essence, one portion has particular honour, namely, that of speech and reason; I do not mean the stream which flows through the mouth and tongue, but I speak of the fountain itself, from which the channels of utterance are, in the course of nature, filled. And this fountain is the mind; by means of which, all our conversations with and cries to the living God take place, at one time being voluntary, and at another involuntary;'

As shown above, in 1.91, Philo divides the soul into two: one part is dumb (ἄφωνόν) and another part is endowed with utterance (φωνήεν) (ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὡς ἐν βραχέσιν εἰρήσθω περὶ οὐσίας ψυχῆς. τὸ δὲ φωνὴν αἵματος βοᾶν κατ' ἀκόλουθον οὕτως ἀποδώσομεν. τῆς ἡμετέρας ψυχῆς τὸ μὲν ἄφωνόν ἐστι, τὸ δὲ

φωνῆεν· τὸ μὲν ἄλογον ἄφωνον, φωνῆεν δ' ὅσον λογικόν, ὃ δὴ μόνον ἔννοιαν εἴληφε θεοῦ· τοῖς γὰρ ἄλλοις μέρεσιν οὔτε θεὸν οὔτε τι νοητὸν καταλαβεῖν δυνάμεθα in 1.91)

Philo states 'the name of God as breath (πνεῦμα) which gives life into all living things' (τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὠνόμασε θεοῦ, διότι ζωτικώτατον τὸ πνεῦμα) in *Op* 1.30 and 'πνεῦμα indeed means God' (πνεῦμα τοίνυν τὸ θεῖόν φησιν) in *Quaes Gen* 2.28. Interestingly, the Greek πνευματικὴν is derived from the word πνεῦμα whose meaning is 'breath' (*Op* 1.67). In addition, Philo describes the feminine of πνευματικός as the nature of prophet or angel in *Abr* 1.113 (προφητῶν ἢ ἀγγέλων μεταβαλόντων ἀπὸ πνευματικῆς καὶ ψυχοειδοῦς) and *Quaes Gen* 1.92 in which πνευματικὴ is depicted as the property of angel and the likeness to human appearance is often found with the need to be transformed (πνευματικὴ δὲ ἡ τῶν ἀγγέλων οὐσία· εἰκάζονται δὲ πολλάκις ἀνθρώπων ιδέαις, πρὸς τὰς ὑποκειμένας χρείας μεταμορφούμενοι). Based on these facts it is likely that Philo generally understood the word πνευματικός as the nature of a prophet or angel originated from the breath of God. G. H. van Kooten remarks that Philo's pneumatological description seems to be placed in the Platonic tradition that 'Philo, following his Platonic predilections, seems to abrogate the body and to conceive of the afterlife only in terms of mind,...'¹⁹²

It is also of interest that the wise speech in silence described in *Conf* 1.33-39 is understood as an angelic language in 1.28 and 1.174a .

1.28 says that:

¹⁹² He also points out that differently from Philo, Paul the apostle's pneumatic idea saying 'the enduring existence of the body and its spiritual transformation' which is analogous to 'Stoic terminology of a pneumatic body.' G. H. van Kooten, 'The Two Types of Man in Philo of Alexandria and Paul of Tarsus. The Anthropological Trichotomy of Spirit, Soul and Body,' in *Philosophische Anthropologie in der Antike* (L. Jansen, C. Jedan and C. Rapp eds.) (Frankfurt am Main: Ontos, 2010), p. 305.

For Moses does not speak of some as having consented and of others having stood aloof; but, as he says, "The whole people surrounded the house all together, both old and young," having entered into a conspiracy against all those holy actions and words which it is customary to call angels.

1.174a says that:

And there is also in the air a most sacred company of incorporeal souls as an attendant upon the heavenly souls; for the word of prophecy is accustomed to call these souls angels.

Furthermore, Philo depicts the basic elements of the universe such as light and air, which are important elements to form sound, as visible and invisible. The dwelling of God is full of visible light, but invisible to others (*Quod Deus* 1.29). For Philo, an angelic language is an invisible sound (*Somn* 1.72; *Quaes Gen* 1.19) which is perceived only by wise men (*Op* 1.12,31; *Ebr* 1.132; *Conf* 1.172; *Heres* 1.15,75,280; *Congr* 1.25; *Somn* 1.188, etc.). In *Dec* 1.33, Philo states that invisible sound is made in the air- a residence of angels (*Conf* 1.174; *Plant* 1.14; *Conf* 1.174). Heavenly-angelic speech is found as silent in *Vita Mos* 1.66 as well as audible. In this regard, invisible silent speech in Philo is comparable to angelic glossolalia.

4.1.2. Philosophical speech with sound and in silence in Lucretius

As to the unbelievers mentioned in 1 Cor 14.23-25, a number of Gentiles might have been included. If so, their understanding of philosophical speech in silence should be considered as well. D. L. Gera stresses that universal-philosophical language to express emotions and passions was widespread in the age of Kronos, which was a philosophical idea of universal conversation between gods, men and animals. It was

widely known among both Stoic and non-Stoic authors such as Plato, Aesop, Philo and Callimachus, Lucretius, and Babrius.¹⁹³ He also explains that ‘an interesting description of such an original language of emotion, perhaps the fullest description to be found in a classical text, is that furnished by the Epicurean poet Lucretius.’¹⁹⁴

In this regard, in the first place Philo’s vocalization with lips and tongues is comparable with that of Lucretius. In *De Rerum Natura* 4.524-594, he says that

In the first place all sounds and voices are heard when they have worked their way into the ears and then struck upon the sense with their body. For voice and sound are incontestably material in composition, since they can beat against the senses. Besides, the voice often scrapes the throat and shouting makes the windpipe rougher as it makes it way out. For when the voice atoms form an excessively large crowd and begin to come out through the narrow space, then obviously the doorway of the mouth is also scraped with the windpipe fully congested. Hence, as they can injure the body, there can be no doubt that voices and words are made up from physical particles. Again, you must be aware how much continuous talking drains men’s bodies, sapping their very sinews and strength, when they talk non-stop from the rising gleam of dawn right up to the shadow of black night, especially if the speech is poured forth at full volume. Therefore the voice must be physical, since the man who speaks a lot loses part of his body. Roughness of the voice is due to the roughness of the particles, as in the same way smoothness of the voice is produced by their smoothness. The elements that pierce the ears are of quite different shapes when the trumpet lows with a deep base boom and the boxwood pipe, the virtuoso foreign instrument, re-echoes its hoarse roar, and when in the icy chill of

¹⁹³ D. L. Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language and Civilization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 18-32,37-38.

¹⁹⁴ Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language and Civilization*, p. 38.

night the birds raise their melodious dirge with mournful voice from the shrubbery of the garden. ... Now when it is no long race that each of those voices has to run from its starting point to reach us, then the separate words must be clearly heard and sifted out joint by joint; for the sound preserves its shaping and its form. But if the intervening course is unreasonably long the words must be mixed up in their passage through a good deal of air, the voice must be distorted while it is flying through the breezes. Thus it happens that you can feel the sound but still be unable to discern the meaning of the words-so mixed up, so encumbered is the voice that arrives. Besides, often a single word thrown from the mouth of a crier stirs the ears of everybody in a public assembly. Therefore a single voice suddenly disintegrates into many voices while in flight, since it shares itself out into separate ears, stamping a shape and a clear sound on the words. But those voices which do not fall into the ears themselves continue travelling past and come to nothing, dispersed idly through the breezes. ... Local people imagine that goat-footed satyrs and nymphs haunt these places, and say that there are fauns, by whose night-roaming noise and playful pranks they commonly claim the speechless silences are broken as the sounds of stringed instruments arise, and the sweet sad music which the pipe pours out when it is struck by the players' fingers; farming folk, they say, become aware of pan from miles away, as he tosses the pine coverings of his half-bestial head, often running the full length of his open reeds with his hooked lip to keep the pipe pouring out an unbroken stream of woodland music. They also talk of all the other marvellous and prodigious things of this kind, just in case they are thought to haunt a region that is so deserted that even the gods have left it. Either that is the reason why they boast of these wonderful things, or they have some other motive, as the human race is marked by excessively greedy little ears.

Philo depicts ἀήρ as black and the second place under the heaven (*Spec Leg* 1.94). Philo regarded sound as a combination of visible and invisible elements. Similarly, Lucretius perceived the black air of darkness and the white air of light in *De Rerum Natura* 4.337-342 ('yet you see things that are in the light when we are in the dark for this reason: the black air of darkness is closer and so first to enter the open eyes and take possession of them; then follows at once the white air of light which, as it were, cleans them out and scatters the black shadows of that first air') and the light falls through the space of air intervening in *De Rerum Natura* 4.185-189 ('the light and the heat of the sun fall in this category because they are made of tiny elements which are, as it were, beaten and so do not hesitate to pass through the space of air intervening, driven on by the blow which follows them'). As for breath and speech, even the weak part of body is indispensable in order to make a sound voice. If feet are weak, it is impossible to make a sound voice ('Since there is nothing which could, as it were, prop up the limbs, the body becomes weak, the limbs grow slack, arms and eyelids droop, legs often buckle underneath you as you lie down and relax their strength' in *De Rerum Natura* 4.950-953). Both Philo and Lucretius recognized the importance of eyes to breathing and sound (*Migr* 1.48,52; *De Rerum Natura* 4.337-342, '...the limbs grow slack, arms and eyelids droop,...' in 952-953).

Furthermore, like Philo, Lucretius, in *De Rerum Natura* 4.453-461, also mentions philosophical speech occurring with sleeping in silence (cf. *Heres* 249,257).

Then, when sleep has fettered out limbs in pleasing repose and the entire body lies in total rest, we nonetheless seem to ourselves to be awake and to be mobbing out limbs, and in the blind blackness of night we think we see the sun and the light of day, we think we can exchange our confined space for sky, sea, rivers, mountains, we seem to be crossing plains on foot and hearing sounds when the strict silences of night are firmly entrenched all around, we seem to be uttering words when we are silent.

Lucretius' primitive man depicted in the *De Rerum Natura* 5.925f. has a similarity to golden age man, while Lucretius' animals are described as mute in 1088 (*muta tamen cum sint*, 'dumb though they nevertheless are'), that is, inarticulate.¹⁹⁵ C. D. N. Costa says that '*mutus* is commonly applied to animals and Lucretius uses it more literally of fish at 2.342 and 1082.'¹⁹⁶ D. L. Gera argues that a divine language after men and gods were separate at Mekone, which was shared by animals and humans was probably silent.¹⁹⁷ In this regard, in the case that the Corinthian church believers spoke in silent tongue, and Gentile unbelievers were aware of Lucretius' divine mute language, they would have recognized it as a primitive universal language.

4.2. The Corinthian church's practice of silent tongue Christianized from Philo

4.2.1. The Corinthian tongue in silence analogous to that of Philo

Based on what the Apostle Paul says, the Spirit reveals the word of God with two kinds of languages: ῥητῶς (expressly or intelligibly in 1 Tim 4.1) and ἄρρητα (inexpressibly or unintelligibly in 2 Cor 12.4). Unintelligible (ἄρρητα) glossolalia should be divided into two as well: glossolalia with sound (1 Cor 14.7) and glossolalia without sound (1 Cor 14.10; Rom 8.26).

Interestingly, Paul describes groaning or sighing (στενάζομεν in 8.23; στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις in 8.26) as a universal language spoken by all the creatures (πάντα ἢ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει in 8.22). There has been divergence in opinions among scholars as to what the expression στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις (unspoken groans)

¹⁹⁵ Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language and Civilization*, pp. 37-38.

¹⁹⁶ Lucretis, *De Rerum Nature* V, C. D. N. Costa (Comm.) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), p. 123.

¹⁹⁷ Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language and Civilization*, pp. 49-50.

in Rom 8.26 (also refer to 2 Cor 5.2,4; cf. Rom 8.22,24) signifies. D. Kim points out that there had not been a lively discussion on the subject until Käsemann argued that it indicated glossolalia. He categorizes the opinions of scholars into two: the kind of glossolalia (Käsemann, H. Balz, K. Stendahl, O. Cullmann, G. Fee) and inarticulate aspiration of believers (A. Schlatter, C. E. B. Cranfield, J. D. G. Dunn, J. A. Fitzmyer, U. Wilckens, D. Moo, R. Jewett, E. Lohse, L. Morris, E. A. Obeng, P. O'Brien).¹⁹⁸

A key to our discussion is the proper understanding of the Greek expression στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις in Rom 8.26. However, what previous scholars have classified as types of στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις as glossolalia or inarticulate aspiration looks impetuous. R. Jewett is an important scholar who pointed out the problem that the Greek ἀλαλήτοις should have been rendered as *silence* (Theognis *Frag. dub.* 6.2; Stobaeus *Anth.* 3.36.1.3; the *Anth.* 5.4.1) and in addition to that, it has a close association with adjective ἄλαλος (Plutarch *Def. orac.* 438b; also refer to ἄλαλα in Philo *Conf* 1.39 which explains about philosophical speech in silence).¹⁹⁹ What is more, in Philo's writings, a groaning sound (στεναγμοῖς) is treated as philosophical-ecstatic speech (*Quod Det* 1.30,91-93). In this regard, therefore, if στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις in Rom 8.26 should be translated into *silent groans*, it will provide a powerful basis for comprehending ἄφωνον in 1 Cor 14.10 as silent glossolalia.

The description of silent tongues in 14.9-10 which looks like the response of an outside strong-believer to the Corinthian strong believers' silent tongue in favour of the Corinthian weak believers, shows an analogy with Philo.

Firstly, as shown above, the Greek ἄφωνον of 1 Cor 14.10 should be translated as 'without sound' or 'silent' and it should be interpreted as indicating divine speech in silence, which is analogous to those in the writings of Philo (ἡσυχία in *Heres* 14; ἄλαλα in *Conf* 1.39; φωνῆς ἡσυχία in *Vita Mos* 1.66; cf. ἀφωνίαν in *Jos* 214).

¹⁹⁸ D. Kim, *신약이 말하는 방언* (용인: 킹덤북스, 2009), pp. 38-39.

¹⁹⁹ R. Jewett, *Romans*, H-CHCB (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), p. 523.

Secondly, ἄδηλον sound of 1 Cor 14.8 designating the Corinthian tongues is analogous to that of Philo. St. Paul says that God speaks His mysteries with uncertain (ἄδηλον) sound of glossolalia (14.2,8). God who is depicted by Philo as *uncertain* (ἄδηλα) ('everything done by Him is ... uncertain, unknown, and incomprehensible by the race of mortal men,' τι ποιεῖν, ἀλλ' εἰδῆς ἄδηλα καὶ ἀτέκμαρτα καὶ ἀκατάληπτα τῷ θνητῷ in *Leg All* 1.20a; 'if when you search you will find God, is uncertain,' εἰ δὲ ζητοῦσα εὐρήσεις θεόν, ἄδηλον in 3.47b) and is described as God who speaks the truth with *uncertain* (ἄδηλα) sound ('For all these things, and others like them, belonging to the fourth and most excellent of the bodies in the world, namely, the heaven, are uncertain and incomprehensible, and are spoken of in accordance with conjectures and guesses, and not with the solid, certain reasoning of truth' in *Somn* 1.23b), is described in similar fashion by the Apostle Paul (1 Cor 14.2,8). Philo describes angelic speech that is perceptible only by the wise men as ἀδηλότερά in *Migr* 1.80. Similarly to that, the Apostle Paul also does not explain silent tongue to be perceptible by all, but rather, says that some may think 'if there are, it may be, so varieties of sounds in the world, and nothing is without sound' (14.10). He depicts the Corinthian silent tongue as ἄδηλον φωνήν which does not give a distinct word (14.8; also see. *Dec* 1.33; *Spec leg* 2.190). Accordingly, these findings support the idea that some of the Corinthian church members along with the Apostle Paul had knowledge of silent tongue.

4.2.2. The Christian-ization of silent tongue found in the Apostle Paul

Admittedly, it is through St. Paul's description on how to use the silent tongue, that one might find its Christianization, distinct from that of Jewish philosopher Philo, even though it is uncertain who sowed God's field at Corinth with the silent tongue.

Firstly, the Corinthians spoke a blessing and a thanksgiving to God with the silent tongue at the table of the Lord (1 Cor 14.16-17). As explained before, C. K. Barrett and Richard Hays identify συνέρχομαι in 14.23,26 with that in 11.17-34, even though

there is no direct mention on the table of the Lord in ch 14.²⁰⁰ Fee points out that the two verbs, εὐλογέω and εὐχαριστέω in 14.16-17 are used in the same way as in 10.16 and 11.24.²⁰¹

Secondly, tongues come to be identified with τὰ πνευματικά St. Paul has sown in God's field (9.11), when what is spoken with tongues is interpreted so that what is interpreted is identified with the greater πνευματικά. Through the greater πνευματικά, people of the Spirit reveal God's wisdom in hidden mystery revealed only by the Spirit (2.6-14). The Corinthian church members were supposed to speak with the Christianized silent tongue the mystery which had been hidden by God before the ages for saints' glory but is now disclosed (2.7; 14.2; cf. Rom 16.25-26).

Mysteries spoken with τὰ πνευματικά signify the cross and the resurrection so that tongues can build up the church, as long as the gifts are interpreted (14.21-23,26-28), the same as prophecy.²⁰² The plural πνευμάτων in 14.12 might signify new church members united to Christ (1 Cor 6.17) and then, one can find logical coherency between 14.12 and 14.22 relating to the reason that tongues are a sign to unbelievers (14.22). The Christian spirituality the Apostle Paul introduced to the Corinthian church is depicted as the spirituality of τὰ πνευματικά. The Apostle Paul never clearly described tongues in such a way that people who spoke in tongues spoke about the mystery of the cross. However, Paul the Apostle's Christian spirituality is explained that all the mysteries of God spoken with tongues should be focused on the mystery of the cross through being weighed with τὰ πνευματικά.

Thirdly, regarding the plural γλώσσαις in the law of 14.21, as opposed to Philo who considered angelic tongue in silence as invisible speech perceptible only by the intellect, the Apostle Paul treats the Christianized silent tongue as equal with as tongue with sound, negatively portrayed as weird tongue in Isa 28.11 LXX and two

²⁰⁰ Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 324; Hays, *First Corinthians*, p. 241.

²⁰¹ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 672, no 35.

²⁰² For further information, see. ch. 5.

Hodayot (1QH^a 10.18-19; 12.16). Furthermore, a linguistic coherence between “to this people” in 1 Cor 14.21 and “to unbelievers” in 14.22 within the enlarged structure of 14.20-38 shows the Christianization of silent tongue in the way that what is spoken by believers should not be allowed to be judged by unbelievers (refer to 2.13-15; ‘God’s foolishness is wiser than human wisdom, and God’s weakness is stronger than human strength’ in 1.25).

4.2.3. The Corinthian strong believers’ wicked and foolish application of the Christianized silent tongue

On the contrary, the Corinthian strong believers show immaturity in applying the silent tongue. Even though the Corinthian church received τὰ πνευματικά from the Apostle Paul, which shows a characteristic of Christianization (2.6-16; 9.11), and he and his co-worker taught them to use the gifts bestowed to them by God in Christ-centered knowledge (1.4-7; 2.12; 3.11; 10.4; 12.5,12-3), they did not fully understand it and their application of the Christianized silent tongue shows childishness.

According to St. Paul’s description in 14.10, it is not likely that the silent tongue was known to all the church members. In other words, there were some of the church members who did not know there had been speech without sound in the world, as if there were weak believers without knowledge of Christianized γνῶσις in the church. If this is the correct understanding and the silent tongue was preferred by strong believers, we can suppose that strong believers’ knowledge of silent tongue would have been Christianized with the Christianized γνῶσις they had (8.4-7). As such, they were expected by the Apostle Paul to use the silent tongue according to his πνευματικά centered morality rather than Jewish idea of that in the way that the silent tongue should have been judged not by unbelievers but by believers.

However, the Corinthian church showed wickedness as well as foolishness in applying τὰ πνευματικά, as they spoke all together at the same time. First, the

Apostle Paul entertained doubts about whether strong believers' application of the silent tongue was wicked. Centering around γνῶσις and the silent tongue the Corinthian church would have been divided into the strong and the weak and there would have been a conflict between the two. Antagonistic puffing up against each other and boasting was widespread in the church (4.8; 5.6). In these divisions between the strong and the weak, and even among the strong, as all the Corinthian spoken in tongues without insisting on interpretation, unbelievers would have filled up the vacancy and awarded honour to those who showed the power of divine speech. At this point the weak who should have kept silent, lacking knowledge of silent tongue would have been marginalized. In this way, 1 Cor 14.23 displays St. Paul's criticism against the strong believers' wicked application of τὰ πνευματικά.

Secondly, Paul addressed their foolishness. St. Paul teaches the Corinthian church to use interpretation so that what is interpreted in part is heard by all (14.27). However, the strong were foolishly unwilling to interpret what fellow believers spoke in the silent tongue in part (14.23, 27). It appears that the relationship between the strong was at odds with each other as well, owing to puffing up and boasting. And thus, when strong believers spoke in the silent tongue, catechumens and unbelievers could not have realized whether it was the Christianized silent tongue so they could have not said ἀμήν (14.16). Even if wise unbelievers positively evaluated the silent tongue as 'you are inspired' (μαίνεσθε), it would have been still far from Christianized inspiration.

4.3. Paul the Apostle's worry about silent tongue: *speaking into the air* as speaking into the lower-heavenly sphere in Philo

As most scholars have pointed out, *speaking into the air* in 1 Cor 14.10 reflects Paul the Apostle's worry about their application of tongue; typically the expression is read negatively. However, most interpret the expression *speaking into the air* as

meaningless/unintelligible sound, rendering ἄφωνον of 14.10 as *meaningless*. On the contrary, as this thesis has argued, if the Greek ἄφωνον should be translated literally as *without sound*, how should the expression *speaking into the air* be rendered?

As for the negative meaning of the Greek ἀήρ, how can it be translated? H. Merklein says that ‘in Jewish conceptions, the air is the abode of demons (cf. Billerbeck IV, 616).’²⁰³ According to Martin P. Nilsson, δαίμονες bridged the gap between the heaven and the earth, and God and mortals. ‘Their abode was the air beneath the moon, and they also wandered about the earth and most especially in the neighbourhood of tombs.’²⁰⁴ James D. G. Dunn also remarks it was common knowledge that among several heavens lower heavens were occupied by hostile spirits.²⁰⁵

So, how will a relation between silent tongue and the word *air* be explained in our epistle? For this, 9.26 will be pivotal to interpret it. A. C. Thiselton rightly pointed out it is through the expression ἀέρα that St. Paul ‘wanted to expose “the strong” at Corinth’ who did not take the weak into consideration and indulged in their high-grade knowledge and freedoms which the weak did not have.²⁰⁶ The Greek συγκοινωνός in 9.23 reflects κοινωνία in the table of the Lord in 10.16. The prize mentioned in 9.24 is awarded to those who do not make full use of the right and exercise self-control to show consideration for the weak (also see. 9.18). The Apostle Paul depicts the strong ones’ obnoxious behaviour that they make full use of the right without thoughtful consideration for the weak at the table of the Lord which might become a stumbling block to the weak, as *running after uncertain things* (cf. τὰ ἄδηλα μετατρέχεις in *Fuga* 1.205-206) and *boxing as though beating into the air* (cf. as to description of air as a likeness to shadows or phantoms see. *Cher* 1.81; *Jos* 1.140) in the metaphor of athletics (refer to boxing and running in *Congr* 1.46). Incidentally, in

²⁰³ H. Merklein, ‘ἀήρ,’ in *EDNT*, vol. 1 (H. Balz and G. Schneider eds.) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1990), p. 34.

²⁰⁴ M. P. Nilsson, *Greek Piety* (H. J. Rose trans.) (New York, The Norton Library, 1969), p. 171.

²⁰⁵ J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998), p.108.

²⁰⁶ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p 715.

Fuga 1.205-206, the expression ἄδηλα μετατρέχεις is used to explain a need for restraining one's self from *what is uncertain* (τῶν ἀδήλων of 1.206).

The sarcastic words ἄδηλον and ἀήρ about the strong believers' unseemly indulgence in the privileged knowledge in 9.26 reappear as the heavenly-uncertain speech in 14.8-10 (also refer to 'the heaven, are uncertain and incomprehensible, and are spoken of in accordance with conjectures and guesses, and not with the solid, certain reasoning of truth' - οὐρανοῦ, ἄδηλα καὶ ἀκατάληπτα, στοχασμοῖς καὶ εἰκασίαις, οὐ παγίῳ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἐφορμοῦντ in *Somn* 1.23); this is described as necessary for exercising self-control from using the silent tongue without interpretation at public worship. In this regard, these findings further support the idea that the silent tongue mentioned in 14.8-11 was privileged by the strong.

First of all, regarding the expression *speaking into the air*, its meaning will become clear as we know whose opinion it is. As explained before, 14.9b should be included in 14.10 and then, it provides an important clue; that is, the opinion holder did not realize there was silent tongue in the world. Accordingly, this could scarcely be St. Paul's opinion – it is unlikely he would have been ignorant of silent tongues (cf. Rom 8.26). If he really did not know it, how could he describe the tongue with the language of Philo such as ἄφωνος and ἄδηλος, which the strong preferred? Moreover, his attitude on the silent tongue is described as positive in 14.21-22 (see. 'I will speak to this people with weird tongues and weird lips' in 14.21 and 'tongues are a sign to unbeliever' in 14.22). Weak believers also are unlikely to be the opinion holder. It is not likely that they were familiar with such language as ἄδηλος or ἀήρ as described in the metaphor of the Isthmian Games by St. Paul with the intention of criticizing the strong ones' excessive self-gratification at high-level knowledge, but also such as ἄφωνος and ἄδηλος with which the strong were preoccupied.

By the way a characteristic comprised in the expression of the speaker is twofold: likely the weak and likely the strong. In other words, who could be ignorant of silent tongues and, yet, be fluent in complex vocabulary like ἄφωνος, preferred by the

strong and ἀήρ used by the Apostle Paul to find fault with the strong believers' indulgence in heavenly-uncertain speech? To cut to the point, it would be most likely, if they were weak believers' faithful believing friends who knew three *Hodayot* as well as the silent tongue found in Philo. If this is correct, distinct from the strong ones' negative interpretation of tongue with sound, based on the thematic tension within three *Hodayot*, they would have interpreted the thematic tension within three *Hodayot* such that the silent tongue preferred by strong believers was interpreted as tongue of deceit leading to divisions in the church. They would have understood the strong believers' application of the silent tongue that meant weak believers might be judged by unbelievers when all the church spoke in tongues, as the strong believers' evil plan. In this regard, it would be most likely that as a strong supporter of weak believers, they criticized the silent tongue using a language of Philo strong believers favoured.

It would be better to investigate the expression's meaning in Philo. As shown before, philosophical speech in silence was described as speaking to heaven. Philo explains heaven's duality in that light coexists with darkness in heaven God dwells (*Spec Leg* 1.94; *Gig* 1.54; *Mut* 1.7; *Vita Mos* 1.158; *Post* 1.14; *Vita Mos* 1.158). To be more precise, *Mut* 1.7 states

'Do not, however, think that the living God, he who is truly living, is ever seen so as to be comprehended by any human being; for we have no power in ourselves to see anything, by which we may be able to conceive any adequate notion of him; we have no external sense suited to that purpose (for he is not an object which can be discerned by the outward sense), nor any strength adequate to it; therefore, Moses, the spectator of the invisible nature, the man who really saw God (for the sacred scriptures say that he entered "into the darkness," [Genesis xx. 21] by which expression they mean figuratively to intimate the invisible essence), having investigated every part of everything, sought to see clearly the much-desired and only God; (μη μέντοι νομίσης τὸ ὄν, ὃ ἐστὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ὄν, ὑπ'

ἀνθρώπου τινὸς καταλαμβάνεσθαι ὄργανον γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἔχομεν, ᾧ δυνησόμεθα ἐκεῖνο φαντασιωθῆναι, οὐτ' αἰσθησιν αἰσθητὸν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν οὔτε νοῦν. Μωυσῆς οὖν ὁ τῆς ἀειδοῦς φύσεως θεατῆς καὶ θεόπτῆς εἰς γὰρ τὸν γνόφον φασὶν αὐτὸν οἱ θεῖοι χρησιμοὶ εἰσελθεῖν, τὴν ἀόρατον καὶ ἀσώματον οὐσίαν αἰνιττόμενοι πάντα διὰ πάντων ἐρευνήσας ἐζήτει τὸν τριπόθητον καὶ μόνον ἀγαθὸν τηλαυγῶς ἰδεῖν.)'

Somn 1.23 explains about the uncertain (ἄδηλα) character of heavenly language ('the heaven, are uncertain and incomprehensible, and are spoken of in accordance with conjectures and guesses, and not with the solid, certain reasoning of truth,' οὐρανοῦ, ἄδηλα καὶ ἀκατάληπτα, στοχασμοῖς καὶ εἰκασίαις, οὐ παγίῳ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἐφορμοῦντα.'). *Migr* 80 describes a heavenly (angelic) language as ἀδηλότερά ('At all events when the conceptions are at all indistinct and ambiguous, speech is the treading as it were on empty air' ἐπειδὴν γοῦν ἀδηλότερά πως ἢ τὰ νοήματα, κατὰ κενοῦ βαίνει'). Furthermore, *Quaes Gen* 1.84 explains the duality of God ('as God is good, he bestows the greatest favors most abundantly, and, at the same time, he effaces the former offenses of those who devote themselves to him, and which might deserve chastisement, by a recollection of their virtues.'). Regarding the idea of 'God in the darkness,' *Vita Mos* 2.194 mentions the Egyptian origin of the duality of heavenly God ('for the Egyptians, ... For in the world the heaven is the most holy temple, and the further extremity is the earth; though this too is in itself worthy of being regarded with honor; but if it is brought into comparison with the air, is as far inferior to it as light is to darkness, or night to day, or corruption to immortality, or a mortal to God.'). In this regard, Philo speaks of the superiority of darkness over light and the mysteries of God are spoken in darkness where God was (See. *Vita Mos* 1.158; *Gig* 1.54; *Mut* 1.7; *Post* 1.14). As seen before, Philo mentions heavenly (angelic) silent speech speaking divine mysteries (*Heres* 266; *Sacr* 60; *Quod Det* 102; *Conf* 37-39).

In this regard, Philo describes philosophical speech as ἀδηλότερά (*Migr* 1.80) and the darkness it has is described as uncertain and false (ἄδηλον καὶ ψευδῆ in *Heres* 303). He also says that some reptilian angels, such as serpents can change their abode

between air and heaven (*Heres* 240). In addition to that, he explains even heavenly-uncertain speech in silence might be understood as being taken by evil spirits ('While he was running on in this way against them they stood motionless and speechless, those most grievous of all evils, sorrow and fear, falling upon them thus suddenly, so that they were unable even to open their mouths, for the advent of unexpected evils makes even those who are eloquent actually speechless;' in *Jos* 214). Paul the Apostle's wording ἄφωνον in 1 Cor 14.10 is identical with ἀφωνίαν of *Jos* 214 rather than ἡσυχία in *Heres* 14,266; ἄλαλα in *Conf* 39; φωνῆς ἡσυχία in *Vita Mos* 1.66 and (στεναγμοῖς) ἀλαλήτοις in Rom 8.26. It is likely, therefore, that these findings exhort modern readers to read 1 Cor 14.9b-10 as St. Paul's worry that there might be some who look with disfavour on the silent tongue and judge the tongue giving uncertain sound to be *speaking into the air* (cf. 10.29).

5. Two sources of the law the Apostle Paul cited in 1 Cor 14.21

Previously scholars have argued that the law in v. 21 was loosely quoted just from Isa 28.11 LXX, and that Paul's citation of the law shows his intention to blame the Corinthians who put glossolalia to wrong use.²⁰⁷ However, I am going to argue that the source of the law of v. 21 is best understood as Paul the Apostle's conflation of Isa 28.11 LXX and the kind of tradition found in two *Hodayot* reworked to address the situation in Corinth.

5.1. The source of the law of 14.21

First of all, I will discuss Paul's citation of Isa 28.11 in 1 Cor 14.21. What purpose did St. Paul quote Isa 28.11 for? The general consensus amongst scholars is that Paul's intention was to lead unbelievers to obedience to God through the application of prophecy rather than the application of glossolalia at the public worship, where unbelievers entered the church and saw what was happening.²⁰⁸ If this is case, what was St. Paul criticising – the act of tongue-speaking itself or the misapplication of unintelligible glossolalia in the public worship assembly?

A serious weakness with the consensus, however, is that it comes into conflict with 14.22. They have attempted to solve the contradiction, but failed to resolve the contradiction between 14.22 and both vv. 21 and 23. Under the circumstances, the reason why St. Paul cited Isa 28.11 in 1 Cor 14.21 is as much in fog as ever, as long as they adhere to the existing structure of 14.20-25.

²⁰⁷ Refer to Sweet, 'A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia,' pp. 243, 244, 246.

²⁰⁸ See. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1130.

As explained before, recently, there has been an attempt by S. J. Chester to show coherence within 14.20-25; he interpreted the Greek μαίνεσθε in 14.23 as divine inspiration and strived to read 14.22-23 in a coherent way.²⁰⁹ In spite of his endeavour, it is still nothing but contradictory to 14.21 (In the Law it is written, “with weird tongues and weird lips I will speak to this people and not even will they listen to me” says the Lord). In this regard, it is important to explain the reason why St. Paul mentioned 14.21 in relation to 14.22-25 and for what purpose St. Paul arrayed the words in 14.21 (ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ καὶ οὐδ’ οὕτως εἰσακούσονται μου). For the sake of the explanation, it is necessary to deal with the problem of the source of the law in 14.21 before everything else.

However, scholars found difficulty in disclosing the source of the law of 14.21 due to the linguistic incoherence between Isa 28.11-12 and 1 Cor 14.21. Moreover, most scholars state that the Apostle Paul followed neither the Hebrew text nor LXX for 1 Cor 14.21. Conzelmann indicates Paul would have cited another translation²¹⁰ and C. K. Barrett suggests he would have cited a version accustomed to the Old Testament translator Aquila.²¹¹ However, as A. C. Thiselton rightly points out, it remains unclear.²¹² D. E. Garland explained nine differences between 1 Cor 14.21 and Isa 28.11-12 in the LXX or the MT.

1. ‘Paul’s text inverts the order of “other tongues” and “stammering lips” so that “other tongues” comes first.’

²⁰⁹ Chester, ‘Divine Madness? Speaking in Tongues in 1 Corinthians 14.23’, pp. 417-446.

²¹⁰ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, p. 242, n. 17.

²¹¹ Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 322. Also see. H. Lietzmann, *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus: An die Korinther I,II*, Handbuch zum neuen Testament 9 (W. G. Kümmel ed.) (Tübingen: Mohr, 1949), p. 73; J. Moffatt, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, MNTC 7 (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938), p. 224; J. Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock trans.) (London: Epworth, 1962), p. 152, n. 14.

²¹² Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1120.

2. 'Paul's text substitutes "other lips" for "stammering lips" with the result that it is synonymous with "other tongues" and correlates more closely to the Corinthian situation.'
3. 'Paul's text uses the first person, "I will speak," which is closer to the MT, where the Lord is the speaker, than the LXX, "for they [the Assyrian invaders] will speak to this people.'"
4. Paul the apostle omits the intelligible message given to Israel that reads 'To whom he said, "This is rest, give rest to the weary, and this is repose,"' because it was not relevant to the Corinthian situation.
5. 'Paul's text has οὐδ' οὕτως (*oud' houtōs*, not even thus) instead of οὐκ (*ouk*, not). This substitution "bridges the gap" created by the previous omission (C. Standley 1992:203) and makes the text more pointed.'
6. 'Paul's text uses the compound verb εἰσακούειν (*eisakouein*), which implies hearing and giving heed, instead of ἀκούειν (*akouein*), which need only imply hearing.'
7. The expression 'they will not want to hear' used in the form of the infinitive in Isa 28.11 is modified into the future tense, 'they will not hear and respond.' Irrespective of whether the unintelligible message was given to Israel due to their previous disobedience to the intelligible word of God as shown in the MT or given to outsiders due to the Corinthian church's wrong application of tongues as explained in 1 Cor 14. 21, the result is same. 'Both Israel and the outsider fail to obey the message, which leads to judgment.'
8. Paul's text adds οὐδ' οὕτως, which means "not even thus" or "not even then" will they hear and respond. In Paul's context, this means that "other tongues" will be useless in causing them to hear and to respond to the Lord.
9. Finally, Paul adds the phrase "says the Lord" to add punch to the quotation (cf. Rom. 12.19).²¹³

²¹³ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 646-647.

D. E. Garland concluded that 'the nine differences from the LXX and the MT fit Paul's purpose so well that it seems more likely that 14.21 represents an interpretive paraphrase of the text that he adapts to this context.'²¹⁴ A. C. Thiselton thinks that 1 Cor 14.21 has diverged from the LXX text of Isa 28.11-12 but '*Paul is simultaneously quoting and applying the passage.*'²¹⁵ Thus, most scholars do not differ that Paul is loosely citing Isa 28.11-12, and the expression 'with strange tongues and strange lips' in 1 Cor 14.21 displays Paul's rendering, to reflect the situation of the Corinthian church. At this point, it raises the question of what difference St. Paul made, as he applied Isa 28.11 to the Corinthian church. It is important to consider that the question should be answered in a way that shows coherent logic within 14.21-22 (23). As such, this thesis's aim is to examine whether the difference came entirely from his originality or if he made the difference by making reference to another text in which Isa 28.11 had been referred to.

Above all, we must address the problem that Garland's explanation of nine differences does not explain the reason why the Corinthian (Jewish) unbelievers were unwilling to listen to the unintelligible word of the Lord, even though they would have known the judgment given to their ancestors resulted from their insubordination. Contrary to Garland's expectations, two *Hodayot* can fill the gap between Isa 28 and 1 Cor 14.21.

Regarding Garland's point 2, this modification is already found in two *Hodayot* in which stammering/stuttering lip is altered into uncircumcised lip.

With reference to his point 3, however, this latitude given to him is similar to that given to the scribes of Dead Sea Scrolls. The scribe(s) of *Hodayot* changed the expression 'they (the Assyrian invaders) will speak to this people' in Isa 28.12 LXX

²¹⁴ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 646-647.

²¹⁵ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1122. As to Paul's loose quotation of Isa 28.11, also see F. Thielman, 'The Coherence of Paul's View of the Law: The Evidence of First Corinthians,' *NTS* 38 (1992), pp. 246-247.

into 'they (false prophets) speak to your people' in 1QH^a 12.16. 10.18-19 display more radical change in that 'they (the wicked in the assembly) have changed them (the words of the Lord) for an uncircumcised lip and a weird tongue of a people without understanding.' It is likely that the emphasis on the first person sing. in 1 Cor 14.21 reflects Paul's intentional alteration adroitly attuned to his theology of τὰ πνευματικά.

As to point 5, Garland's explanation that the expression οὐδ' οὕτως makes the text more pointed, is unpersuasive, in that οὐδ' οὕτως would rather make a gap between the two texts in the reason that what understands the Corinthian (Jewish) unbelievers, that is, this people as those who would not listen to the unintelligible word of the Lord merely through direct intertextuality between Isa 28.11-12 and 1 Cor 14.21, results in an interpretive error describing them as too much unintelligent. Surely, the Corinthian Jewish unbelievers would have disapprovingly interpreted their ancestors' disobedience to the unintelligible word of the Lord.

With respect to point 7, as explained above, there is a gap between the two texts in that the οὐκ (*ouk*, not) of Isa 28.12 was more negatively expressed as οὐδ' οὕτως in 1 Cor 14.21, as if Paul the Apostle's contemporary Jews were unaware of their ancestors' mistake; two *Hodayot* fill the gap.

Regarding point 8, οὐδ' οὕτως will have to be understood as unwillingness rather than uselessness. The unwillingness is explained in two *Hodayot* that interpret weird tongue as speaking by men of Belial.

Consequently, a possible explanation for this might be that these differences can be explained in part by the proximity of two *Hodayot* and 1 Cor 14.21.

5.2. A tongue and a lip in the *Hodayot*

5.2.1. Linguistic sameness and modification to Isa 28.11 in the *Hodayot*

It has been presented by some scholars that the Qumran library has influenced St. Paul.²¹⁶ What is surprising is that similar expressions to לְעִי שִׁפָּה וּבִלְשׁוֹן אַחֲרָת of Isa 28.11 ('Truly, with stammering lip and with another tongue he will speak to this people.') are found in three *Hodayot* (1QH^a 10.18-19; 12.16-17; 26.12-16) in which Isa 28.11 Hebrew was cited in 1QH^a 12.16-17 ('They speak to your people [with] stut[ter]ing lip and weird tongue to convert to folly all their deeds with deceit.') but 10.18-19 ('But they have changed them for an uncircumcised lip and a weird tongue of a people without understanding, and so that they will be ruined by their mistake.') displays a linguistic modification, as in 1 Cor 14.21.

לְעִי שִׁפָּה וּבִלְשׁוֹן אַחֲרָת (with stammering lip and with another tongue) Isa 28.11/1QH^a 12.16-17

עָרוֹל שִׁפָּה וּבִלְשׁוֹן אַחֲרָת (for an uncircumcised lip and another/*weird*²¹⁷ tongue) 1QH^a 10.18-19

When the expression of Isa 28.11 was cited in 1QH^a 10.18-19, the scribes of *Hodayot* made a linguistic alteration that the Hebrew עָרוֹל (uncircumcised) of 1QH^a 10.18b has been substituted for the Hebrew לְעִי (stammering/stuttering) of Isa 28.11, while the juxtaposition of a lip and a tongue is significant as a linguistic frame for both Isa 28.11/1QH^a 12.16-17 and 1QH^a 10.18-19.

²¹⁶ Refer to S. F. Noll, 'Qumran and Paul,' in *DPHL* (G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin, and D. G. Reid eds.) (Leicester, England: IVP, 1993), pp. 777-783.

²¹⁷ The translation of אַחֲרָת into 'weird' is adopted from *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* edited by F. G. Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar.

In addition to the slight modifications in 1QH^a 10.18b-19, 1QH^a 26.12²¹⁸ (שִׁפְתָי עִזּוּ וּלְשׁוֹן נִצְחָה) makes a modification of considerable extent in both the juxtaposition of ‘a lip and a tongue’ and the couplet of ‘stammering/stuttering and another/weird.’ As to the juxtaposition, sing. lip is altered into pl. lips and as to the couplet, the terms ‘stuttering’ and ‘weird’ are given opposite meanings, namely ‘stalwart’ and ‘powerful.’ In this way, one can find that the phrase ‘with stammering lip and with alien tongue’ in Isa 28.11 is applied in the various ways by the scribes of the *Hodayot*.

5.2.2. Thematic tension in the *Hodayot* as to lips and a tongue

Regarding ‘the unity of the theological claims’ in the *Hodayot*, J. Maston mentions two points to be considered in finding and reconstructing theological themes that create a thematic and emotional tension in 1QH. Firstly, ‘the repetition of key thoughts and expressions with the same basic meaning suggests that a coherent thought pattern underlies and joins the individual hymns together.’ Secondly, we need to admit that ‘the *Hodayot* may not fit everything together in a manner that satisfies current philosophical and theological arguments’ in deciding what was the author(s)’s doctrine in which the relationship between God and humanity was revealed.²¹⁹ In this regard, with respect to the fact that a thematic tension occurs in the repetition of the juxtaposition of a lip and a tongue in 1QH, the study to explore whether the repetition shows a thematic unity is needed.

Among those who have studied the wisdom of the *Hodayot*, Sarah Jean Tanzer who surveyed the strong wisdom shown in eight *Hodayot* (13.1-21; 15.8-26; 1.1-2.2; 7.26-33; 9.37-10.12; 11.3-4; 11.29-12.36; 18.16-33), said that ‘the correlation of wisdom and

²¹⁸ [his] na[me with stalwart lips and powerful tongue, raise your voices in unison in all periods,] cause [the sound of the shout] to be hea[r]d, rejoice with everlasting happiness, and bow down unceasingly] in the united [assembly... (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* by F. G. Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar)

²¹⁹ J. Maston, *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 79-80.

folly with truth and evil, respectively' was found as one of themes that occur in these *Hodayot*.²²⁰ Interestingly, the repetition of a lip and a tongue appears among the eight *Hodayot* in which a thematic contrast between a weird tongue and a powerful tongue in wisdom occurs. In the two *Hodayot* (10.18 and 12.16), the expression 'stuttering lip' of Isa 28.11 is modified into 'uncircumcised lip' in 1QH^a 10.18, but 'a weird tongue' of Isa 28.11 is unmodified in both 1QH^a 10.18 and 12.16 and it forms a contrast to 'a powerful tongue' in 26.12. In this regard, the scribes of the *Hodayot* seem to have reworked Isa 28.11 in 1QH^a 10.18-19 and 26.12 according to Jewish wisdom tradition of a lip and a tongue²²¹ and emphasized without a doubt the contrast between 'a weird tongue' and 'a powerful tongue.' We can easily find that the strong wisdom of *Hodayot* is reflected in the words both 'stalwart lips' and 'powerful tongue' in 26.12. A powerful tongue leads people to wisdom, while a weird tongue converts people to folly.

The term tongue is used 12 times in Isaiah (3.8; 19.18; 28.11; 29.24; 32.4; 35.6; 41.17; 45.23; 50.4; 57.4; 59.3; 66.18) in which 'strange/weird tongue' is described as foolish tongue which does not speak readily and distinctly (29.24; 32.4) so that its meaning is uncertain. George Brooke, arguing what is called 'reworking the Bible' at Qumran, says that , 'every book of the Bible has been found at Qumran except Esther' and 'the reworked scriptural materials found in the Qumran library show in a significant way various features of how the transformation of authoritative scriptures into canonical biblical books took place.'²²² M. A. Knibb says that the expression 'uncircumcised lips' and 'strange/weird tongue' in 1QH 10.18-19 (2.18-19) indicates the false teaching of the opponents of the psalmist.²²³ Shiu-Lun Shum also writes of the inter-

²²⁰ S. J. Tanzer, *The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the Hodayot* (a PhD dissertation; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, Jan. 1987), pp. 53-56.

²²¹ Regarding the juxtaposition of a lip and a tongue in Jewish tradition, refer to Job 27.4; Ps 10.7; 12.3,4; 34.13; 106.19; 120.2; 140.3; Pro 12.19; 17.4; 18.21; Sol 4.11; Isa 11.7; 28.11; 30.27; 59.3; Ezk 3.26; Sir 22.27; 51.2; 4 Esd 13.10.

²²² G. Brooke, 'Between authority and canon: the Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process,' in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (E. G. Chazon, D. Dimant & R. A. Clements eds.) (Leiden: Brill, 2005), p. 86-87.

²²³ M. A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 168.

textual connection between 1QH 10.9 and Isa 28.11 that ‘the psalmist’s use of these phrases effects a sharp contrast between the teachings of the “men of deceit” and his own (cf. lines 13-15). For him, the teachings of the “men of deceit” had no true knowledge; they were even incomprehensible and meaningless.’²²⁴

Accordingly, the expression of stammering (stuttering) lip and weird tongue of Isa 28.11, which clearly indicates the unintelligible word of the Lord, has been reworked in 1QH^a 12.16-17 as specifying the tongue of the opponent of the “Teacher of Righteousness.” Going a step ahead, the scribe of *Hodayot* modified the phrase stuttering lip of 12.16-17 into uncircumcised lip in 10.18-19, so that it emphasized evil doing which belongs to an assembly of Belial (see. 1QS 5.25-26; 1QH^a 14.20-21). On the contrary, in 26.12-16, the powerful tongue of the righteous was described as perfect for building up the assembly as opposed to the weird and unhealthy tongue of the opponents that is not suitable for revealing the mystery of God. In this way, one can find a thematic tension within three *Hodayot* between the “Teacher of Righteousness” and his opponents made by the scribe(s) of *Hodayot*.

5.3. The tradition of two *Hodayot* and Isa 28.11 LXX in 1 Cor 14.21

5.3.1. The linguistic closeness of 1 Cor 14.21 to the tradition of two *Hodayot*

The phraseology of 1 Cor 14.21 is closer to the tradition shown in two *Hodayot* than Isa 28.11, as the following evidence demonstrates. Firstly, the Hebrew of Isa 28.11 was quoted in 1QH^a 12.16-17 and two *Hodayot* provide evidence of a precedent for St. Paul’s quotation of the law of Isa 28.11. His deliberate word combination of “with weird tongues and weird lips” that leaves out the modifier “stammering/stuttering” (φαυλισμὸν, אַפְּלִי) for lips, which has a comparatively negative meaning and comes

²²⁴ S. L. Shum, *Paul’s Use of Isaiah in Roman: A Comparative Study of Paul’s letter to the Romans & the Sibylline & Qumran sectarian Texts* (Tübingen: Mohr, 2002), p. 143.

into line with “weird” instead, shows a thematic tension between weird and stammering/stuttering, whose paradigm was already produced through a thematic tension between stuttering and uncircumcised in two *Hodayot*. Thus, it is likely that the kind of tradition of two *Hodayot* showing the deliberate modification of the incipient law of Isa 28.11 would have given precedent for St. Paul’s free arrangement of the words of Isa 28.11 in 1 Cor 14.21.

Secondly, this finding explains the reason why in the law of 1 Cor 14.21, St. Paul said they would not listen to the Lord, which probably reflected Paul the Apostle and his contemporary Jews’ understanding of weird tongue. As explained before, if the unbelievers at Corinth should be delineated as foolish, so much so that they will not even listen to what was spoken in unintelligible tongue, as argued by most scholars, it is probably a misunderstanding of both Christians and Jews in relation to speaking in tongues.

It is likely, therefore, that the linguistic proximity of the law in 14.21 to two *Hodayot* is more likely to be right than St. Paul’s direct-loose quotation of the law from Isa 28.11.

In this regard, the Apostle Paul would have referred to two laws (Isa 28.11 and three *Hodayot*) to enact the law of 1 Cor 14.21. The version of the law represented by the *Hodayot* is critically different to the version in Isa 28.11 with respect to audible glossolalia in this one regard. Isa 28.11 describes weird tongue as unintelligible tongue from God but the two *Hodayot* depicts it as unintelligible tongue spoken by men of Belial. However, as for the Greek γλῶσσα, the Apostle Paul altered the singular for the plural in 1 Cor 14.21, so that both cases of normal tongue and the silent tongue should be included in weird tongues, no matter what kind of tongue was spoken by the Corinthian church. Furthermore, he made the linguistic coherence between τῶ λαῶ τούτῳ of 14.21 and τοῖς ἀπίστοις of 14.22 and the pl. ἀπίστοις of 14.22 is connected to the pl. ἄπιστοι of 14.23. In this way, a negative anticipation of unbelievers’ response to tongues in the law of 14.21 (they will not

listen to the Lord) is connected to the Greek *μαίνεσθε* of 14.23. In other words, although the two possible types of tongues are positively explained as conveying the word of the Lord, unbelievers' responses should be interpreted according to each type of tongue. On the one hand, well-informed unbelievers would have understood normal glossolalia to be the tongue of prophet of fraud which was used to deceive fellow believers (1QH^a 10.16-19; 12.12-17); then, the Greek *μαίνεσθε* of 1 Cor 14.23 can be interpreted as 'out of mind caused by Satan's temptation (cf. Joh 10.20).' On the other hand, less-educated unbelievers would not listen to the silent tongue, because they would have not known that there was prophetic speech in silence in the world. Indeed, they would have been bewildered to listen to it.

And, even if well-educated Jewish unbelievers responded to the silent tongue as 'you are inspired' (*μαίνεσθε*) and less-educated Jewish unbelievers gave the same response to normal glossolalia as 'you are inspired' (*μαίνεσθε*), in St. Paul's view, it would seem to be still far from the *ἀμὴν* required from catechumens and unbelievers in response to church education of from unbelievers to interpreted Christianized tongues. At this point, unbelievers' judgment would have done nothing but aggravate conflict between the strong and the weak in the Corinthian church.

We may now ask for what reason has the Apostle Paul referred to the two laws and reworked the law in 14.21? It will be answered in the following sections.

5.3.2. Intertextuality of τῶ λαῶ τούτῳ between Isa 28.11 LXX and 1 Cor 14.21 and its meaning within 14.20-38

Weird tongues and weird lips of 14.21 described as "imperfect wisdom" (*παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν* in 1 Cor 14.20) in giving this people the word of the Lord are parallel to the imperfection of tongues to be a sign to unbelievers without interpretation in v. 22. Furthermore, differently from two *Hodayot* (1QH^a 10.18-19;

12.16-17), in which *uncircumcised/stuttering lip and weird tongue* were depicted as devilish speech by which prophets of fraud deceive fellow believers into stumbling over a stone, Isa 28.11 represents *stammering lip and weird tongue* as divine oracle from the Lord in the same way as in the law of St. Paul in 1 Cor 14.21. In doing so, St. Paul, at 14.21, would, on the basis of Isa 28.11, have reinterpreted the kind of the law reflecting the two *Hodayot*, which was well known at least by a wise Jew contemporary with himself.

The expression τῶ λαῶ τούτῳ in 1 Cor 14.21 exhibits a linguistic sameness with Isa 28.11 LXX which is not found in two *Hodayot*. Why does St. Paul opt for this linguistic sameness? Firstly, in the Paul Apostle's logic, we can find this people (dat. τῶ λαῶ τούτῳ) is identified with unbelievers (dat. τοῖς ἀπίστοις) through the subordinating conjunction ὥστε of 14.22. Through this, the importance of a Jew or God-fearer is highlighted for unbelievers' identity in 14.20-25.

Secondly, it is through the linguistic sameness, the Apostle Paul encourages the Corinthian church to form one body in Christ in varieties of gifts. In our new structure of 14.20-38, 14.21-22 says about *what* the Lord speaks to unbelievers with tongues and 14.26-28 says about *how* decently and in an ordered manner in the united assembly. The linguistic sameness shows St Paul's pastoral wisdom to cure the wrong application of gifts in divisions. In other words, the Corinthian church's arrogant attitude toward fellow believers caused a dispute in which they applied tongues to become a sign not unbelievers but to believers, and as a consequence of this, not only would unbelievers have not listened to unintelligible tongues without interpretation but weak believers would have become vulnerable to criticism by wise unbelievers.

Paul the Apostle's answer is to pursue forming one body in varieties of gifts. Diversity is displayed by two or three speaking in tongues in a part (μέρος), in an ordered manner (14.27,40). As unintelligible speech from each part is interpreted, unbelievers will listen to the Lord. On the contrary, standardization of gifts may

bring about chaos; not only will unbelievers not listen to tongues but division between the strong and the weak in the church will be aggravated.

In addition, the morality of equality based on ἀγάπη is supposed to be guaranteed through variety. Variety should be observed in the way that a part consisting of weak members should not be marginalized (11.22; 12.22-24; 14.27). In a case of noisy tongue, wisdom (φροσίν) of ἀγάπη asks earnestly for the strong to interpret what was spoken in tongue by the weak so that the weak might not be disregarded due to unbelievers misunderstanding of it. In another case of silent tongue, φροσίν entreats the strong to interpret what was spoken in tongue by fellow strong believers. Consequently, the weak might not be marginalized after all the strong were praised by well-educated Jewish unbelievers for their intelligence in giving ἄδηλον sound. Thus, the reason that St. Paul emphasized the linguistic sameness of τῶ λαῶ τούτῳ between Isa 28.11 LXX and 1 Cor 14.21 is explained as his wise guidelines for the Corinthian church to use tongues to become a sign not to believers but, to unbelievers with variety and equality in one body united.

Thirdly, The application of tongues guided by the linguistic sameness between Isa 28.11 (LXX) and 1 Cor 14.21 leads unbelievers to ἀμῆν. As for the expression ‘with stammering lip and with another tongue’, both Isa 28.11 LXX (διὰ φαυλισμὸν χειλέων διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας) and Hebrew (בְּלִפְתֵּי שִׁפְהָ וּבְלִשׁוֹן אֶחָדָת) display a linguistic arrangement of a (stammering) – b (lip)- b’ (tongue)- a’ (weird). Two *Hodayot* also show a coherent linguistic arrangement of a (uncircumcised/stammering) – b (lip) - b’ (tongue) - a’(weird) (ערוֹל שִׁפְהָ וּבְלִשׁוֹן אֶחָדָת) in 1QH^a 10.18-19 and בְּלִפְתֵּי שִׁפְהָ וּבְלִשׁוֹן אֶחָדָת in 12.16). However, breaking the coherence of linguistic arrangement at two *Hodayot*, 26.12 displays a new linguistic arrangement of b (lips) – a (stalwart) - b’(tongue) - a’ (powerful) (שִׁפְתֵי עוֹז וּלְשׁוֹן נֹחַ) ←). In this way, one can realize that the scribe of *Hodayot* made a linguistic change in the early law in Isa 28.11 LXX and Hebrew, and 1QH^a 12.16-17.

St. Paul, in 1 Cor 14.21, also gave the early law a linguistic metamorphosis into an arrangement of a'b'(ἑτερογλώσσοις) – b (χείλεισιν) – a (ἑτέρων) in which not only has the arrangement of a-a' been reversed into a'-a so, that tongues have been emphasized, but also the words 'strange tongues' are compounded into ἑτερογλώσσοις. The newly-coined word is enough to give a sense of difference from γλώσσης ἑτέρας of Isa 28.11 LXX. In addition to that, the coined word is reinforced not just through the linguistic sameness of τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, but through the linguistic coherence between τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ of 14.21 and ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπίστοις of 14.22. In this way, we can see that in St. Paul's description, the Corinthian church's application of tongues was Christian-ized; as such, it should have been used both to form unity and equality between the strong and the weak in the body of Christ and to make catechumens and unbelievers say ἀμήν rather than judge what is spoken with tongues by believers.

5.4. Conclusion:

This study has found, for the first time, that three *Hodayot* is a probable intertext for the law of 1 Cor 14.21 along with Isa 28.11 LXX. The most obvious finding to emerge from this study is that there was an attitude of loathing toward glossolalia with sound in Jewish-Christianity. The findings of this research, in relation to the hypothesis that the Corinthian church members spoke two types of tongues, provide insights for divisions concerning the two tongues between strong believers and weak believers within the Corinthian church.

This study has demonstrated, for the first time, not only a linguistic sameness and modification to Isa 28.11 in the *Hodayot*, but inter-textuality of τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ between Isa 28.11 LXX and 1 Cor 14.21. These findings enhance our understanding of why unbelievers at Corinth would not listen to tongues. A key strength of the present study is finding clarity in Paul the Apostle's purpose shown through a

linguistic coherence between τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ of 14.21 and οὐ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπίστοις of 14.22; his rationale was encouraging the Corinthian church into making one body in Christ in which weak believers were equally treated.

The findings in this report are subject to at least three limitations. Firstly, this study is limited by the lack of information on the Corinthian church's application of silent tongue which is analogous to that in Philo. Another important limitation lies in the fact that this study lacks concrete evidence of the Jews' deep dislike of audible-unintelligible divine speech in the times of Paul the Apostle. Thirdly, the study is also in need of evidence that the knowledge of silent speech in Philo and *Hodayot* was a criterion to divide into the strong and the weak in Jewish-Christianity. Future research should therefore concentrate on the investigation of the strong ones' unwillingness to speak in tongue with sound in Jewish-Christianity in the early church. Notwithstanding these limitations, the study suggests that it seems difficult to exclude the possibility that prophetic-philosophical speech in silence in Philo and three *Hodayot* were known to unbelievers at Corinth. Thus, these findings can contribute not only to extend our knowledge of 1 Cor 14.20-22(23), but to more dramatically read the text in regular order.

6. μαίνεσθε as the opinion of unbelievers in 1 Cor 14.23

Previously, scholars have operated with a problematic structure of 14.20-25 in which 14.22 is contradictory to 14.23-25. I am going to argue that 14.23 speaks of Paul the Apostle's worry that if all believers speak in tongues, Jewish unbelievers would judge believers' speaking in tongues and cause aggravation of the divisions within the church, wounding the conscience of weak believers. This will involve arguing that the linguistic coherence of 14.21-22 (τῶ λαῶ τούτῳ in 14.21 and οὐ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπίστοις in 14.22) points to the likelihood of the 'unbelievers' being Jewish. Not seeing this, scholars have misinterpreted the Greek μαίνεσθε. This chapter will explore several possible senses of this term, in both Greek and Jewish contexts, including the thing I discussed in ch. 4, namely, the interpretive possibility that 1 Cor 14.10 (14.2 as well) describes silent tongue, which could also affect the range of possible interpretations of μαίνεσθε.

The following is a presentation of the evidence to this end. First of all, it is through the linguistic coherence of unbelievers in 14.21-23 that the identity of the unbelievers in 14.23 is more likely to be Jewish than Gentile. Next, as shown before, in our structure of 14.20-38, the expression 'if all speak in tongues' in 14.23 is contradictory to another expression 'two or at most three speak' in 14.27. Thus, in 14.23, St. Paul describes a serious problem that unbelievers might judge tongues spoken by believers, if all speak in tongues. In other words, strong believers with γνῶσις dared to appoint as judges, not fellow believers but unbelieving-Jewish friends, as they had a religious case (6.1f.; 14.23-25). If all believers speak in tongues, there will be no one to interpret and unbelievers will judge the Corinthian tongues, against which St. Paul raised a strong objection and established a principle that people of the Spirit could judge all things without being subject to other people's scrutiny (2.15). In this regard, the Apostle Paul declared that 'tongues are a sign not to believers but to unbelievers' (14.22), to secure the weak against manipulation and marginalization by well-educated Jews and Christians and to exhort the Corinthian church to be united in Christ. Thirdly, as for the word 'unbelievers', the Apostle Paul used the plural in 14.23 (ἰδιῶται ἢ ἀπίστοι), and the singular in 14.24 (ἀπιστος ἢ ἰδιώτης). The emphasis on a plurality of unbelievers in 14.23 reflects Paul the Apostle's worry

about the diversity of the unbelievers' response; this could lead to divisions in the church being aggravated if all believers speak in tongues.

This evidence supports my argument for the following reasons. The Corinthian believers are divided into two: strong and weak. We could also divide the possible types of unbelievers using the same kind of distinction that we applied to believers: strong (well-educated) unbelievers and weak (less-educated) unbelievers. The intellectual unbelievers also might be divided into three. Unbelievers who preferred Philo, unbelievers who preferred the kind of ideas seen in the *Hodayot*, and unbelievers knew both Philo and the kind of tradition seen in the *Hodayot*. There are three possible types of response.

1. A possible response to the Corinthian tongue in silence (14.10) is from well-educated Jewish unbelievers aware of the philosophical speech in silence in Philo. They would have said $\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ meaning 'you are inspired' to those who spoke in silent tongue.
2. Another possible response to the two possible types of tongues is from well-educated Jewish unbelievers aware of *Hodayot*. In the logic in 14.21-23, the Apostle Paul's endeavour is to sort out a tendency toward a very negative attitude to weird tongues, that not even this people (Jewish unbelievers) will listen to the Lord, even if the Lord speaks to them with weird tongues (either normal glossolalia or glossolalia in silence). As shown before, the coherent-linguistic arrangement of $\tau\tilde{\omega} \lambda\alpha\tilde{\omega} \tau\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega$ of 14.21 and $\text{o}\tilde{\upsilon} \text{t}\tilde{\omega}\text{i}\tilde{\varsigma} \text{p}\tilde{\iota}\text{s}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\upsilon}\text{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\text{s}\tilde{\iota}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\grave{\alpha} \text{t}\tilde{\omega}\text{i}\tilde{\varsigma} \acute{\alpha}\text{p}\tilde{\iota}\text{s}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\omega}\text{i}\tilde{\varsigma}$ of 14.22, reflects this endeavour. The thematic tension of weird-powerful in three *Hodayot* (1QH^a 10.7,18-19; 12.16-17; 26.12-16) is sufficient for explaining the negative tendency toward normal tongue. Surely, 26.12-16 shows a positive tendency toward intelligible speech. It is likely that in the situation of divisions in the church, believers who preferred *Hodayot* were about to make intimate friends outside the church. They would have taken $\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ to mean 'you are possessed by Belial' to those who spoke in tongues whether normal tongue or silent tongue.
3. If there were those who were aware of both Philo and *Hodayot*, they would have puffed up on behalf of themselves against to the weak (cf. 1 Cor 4.6). We can imagine that of all the well-educated unbelievers, the third was probably

regarded as most honorable for whom μαίνεσθε can have a dual meaning: 'you are inspired' to those who spoke in silent tongue or 'out of mind caused by Satan's temptation' to those who spoke in normal glossolalia.

At any rate, there was an atmosphere in which the strong disregarded the weak and their normal tongue in the church. In the Corinthian church, there were strong believers who sinned against weak believers and wounded weak believers' conscience with their authority (ἐξουσία) that would become to a stumbling stone to the weak (8.9-12). If they were identified with the Corinthian women prophets, it would not be a mere accident that evil companies were described as fem. pl. ὀμιλῖαι κακάι in 15.33 (also see. fem. τῆ κακίᾳ of 14.20 as opposed to masc. φρονίμοι of 4.10 and φρονίμοις of 10.15, and also see. fem. τῆ σῆ γνώσει in 8.11).²²⁵

To conclude, interpreting the Greek μαίνεσθε of 14.23 in the extended structure of 14.20-38, in which the Apostle Paul shows deep worry concerning unbelievers judging believers and weaker believers being despised within the divided community, makes better sense than the reading in the former structural pattern.

6.1. Unbelievers in 14.23: a priority of Jewish identity over non-Jewish identity

Above all, nothing would be more important than making the identification of unbelievers in order to comprehend properly the meaning of the Greek μαίνεσθε in 14.23. Previously, scholars have read 14.20-25 assuming that 14.22 would be Paul the Apostle's logical mistake, but as explained before, I am going to read 14.20-25 in regular order so that the identification of unbelievers will be disclosed afresh and as a result, the word μαίνεσθε will have to be re-interpreted.

²²⁵ These Greek words are feminine because they always are but it is still interesting when a writer chooses to use masculine nouns in one way and feminine ones in another way.

6.1.1. Identifying ἰδιῶται as catechumens in the coherent structure of 14.20-25

The Greek ἰδιώτης appears 4 times in the Pauline epistles (1 Cor 14.16,23,24; 2 Cor 11.6). In 2 Cor 11.6, it is explained as unskilled or untrained (cf. Ac 4.13), while it is mentioned alongside the Greek ἄπιστος in 1 Cor 14.23-25. As H. W. Bartsch indicated, scholars have been perplexed about what the word ἰδιῶται or ἰδιώτης would signify between “the uninitiated” and “catechumens.”²²⁶ According to A. C. Thiselton, many scholars have suggested interpreting the phrase ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου in 14.16 as those who sit in the place of ‘layperson or proselyte or more plausibly a catechumen’ rather than ‘a non-expert’ in the gifts of the Spirit.²²⁷ The reason that it has been interpreted as “the uninitiated” is because the expression “building up” was normally used in relation to believers by the Apostle Paul (cf. 14.16-17).²²⁸ Nonetheless, an interpretive possibility that the Greek can mean a catechumen or a participant who is not fully a member has been presented.²²⁹ BAGD says that in 1 Cor 14.23f. ‘the ἰδιώτου are neither similar to the ἄπιστοι (against Ltzm., Hdb. ad loc.), nor are they full-fledged Christians; obviously they stand between the two groups as a kind of proselytes or catechumens.’²³⁰ However, H. Schlier states a slightly different opinion from BAGD that in 14.16 the ἰδιώτου are comprehended as non-Christians who do not understand tongues-speaking so that they should not be categorized as a middle position between believers and unbelievers.²³¹

²²⁶ H. W. Bartsch, ‘ἰδιώτης,’ *EDNT*, 2 (H. Balz and G. Schneider eds.) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1991), p. 172.

²²⁷ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1115.

²²⁸ See. Bartsch, ‘ἰδιώτης,’ p. 172; G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 672-673.

²²⁹ BAGD; L. Morris, *The First epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, TNTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985), pp. 195-196; R. P. Martin, *The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12-15* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1984), p. 71. According to Fee, this translation has been regarded as ‘the traditional stance of German scholarship.’ Fee, p. 672, no. 42.

²³⁰ BAGD, p. 370.

²³¹ H. Schlier, ‘ἰδιώτης,’ *TDNT*, 3 (G. Kittel ed) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1965), p. 217.

However, as having been explained throughout this dissertation, I argue that 14.20-25 has a coherent structure so, the meaning of the Greek ἰδιῶται of 14.23 should be explained within the structure of 14.20-25 rather than in the light of intertextuality with 2 Cor 11.6. If this is the correct comprehending, the Greek ἰδιῶται of 14.23 should be rendered into the word, ‘catechumen’ meaning a beginner who is learning about the Christian faith. Arguments for that are as follows. Firstly, as H.-W. Bartsch pointed out,²³² the word ἰδιῶται is mentioned with ἄπιστοι side by side in 14.23-24. Secondly, when we read 14.20-25 in regular order, we will realize that the word ἰδιῶται will come to be put with ἄπιστοι in the same category of this people. Translating the word ἰδιῶται into unskilled people ends in making 14.22 St Paul’s logical mistake. Surely 14.22a says that ‘tongues are a sign not to believers but to unbelievers.’ Thirdly, definitely, it is unlikely that ἰδιῶται of 14.23 is identified as unskilled people who consist of unbelievers and believers; it looks illogical that some of the ungifted believers were included in ἰδιῶται to give judgment along with unbelievers when the whole church was speaking in tongues all together at the same place. Consequently, differently from the example of 2 Cor 11.6, it is likely that ἰδιῶται or ἰδιώτης of 1 Cor 14 should be categorized as non-believers or outsiders and the interpretive possibility that a non-expert-believer at speaking in tongues might belong to ἰδιῶται or ἰδιώτης of 14.23-24, should be excluded.²³³

6.1.2. An inclination of catechumens unbaptised and unbelievers toward a priority of Jewish identity

If, then we accept that ἰδιῶται are categorized as unbelievers, the Greek μαίνεσθε of 14.23 will have to be limited only to the unbelievers’ response. It seems more likely that they are to be identified as Jewish unbelievers in 1 Cor. 14.

²³² Bartsch, ‘ἰδιώτης,’ p. 172.

²³³ Regarding argument that the word ἰδιώτης can mean a non-expert, either a Christian or an unbeliever, refer to Robertson and Plummer, *First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, pp. 313-314, 317-318.

6.1.2.1. Unbaptised catechumens' ἀμήν to the prayer of thanksgiving in Jewish-Christian educational atmosphere in 14.16

In 14.16, catechumens are expected to say ἀμήν to believers' tongues-prayer of praise and thanksgiving, as tongues are interpreted, which shows that they were educated in the Christianized-Jewish atmosphere of the church. D. E. Garland supposes the Corinthian unbelievers' social background to be varied as 'the non-Christian spouse (7.12-15), unconverted slaves, invited guests, or possibly the curious who might wander in.'²³⁴ S. J. Hafemann assumes that most of the Corinthians were Gentiles, since it was prohibited for Jews to partake in pagan idolatry (1 Cor 6.10-11; 8.7; 12.2) and temple feasts (8.1-11.1).²³⁵ However, although the Corinthian church consisted mainly of Gentiles, they would have taught catechumens and unbelievers Jewish laws in the church (9.8,9; 14.21,34; 15.56). When some unbelieving Gentiles visited the church, as long as they entered the church, they would have been impressed with the Christianized Jewish atmosphere.

According to J. L. Wu, the purpose of the application of ἀμήν in the church is not merely liturgical. It is also an affirmation to the prayers or thanksgiving of another person which results in promoting 'the unity of the congregation through their corporate utterance of ἀμήν together (cf. Rom 15.33)' or leading 'the readers into a verbal affirmation of the doctrinal beliefs which they are in danger of abandoning (see Gal 1.3-5).'²³⁶ On the other hand, in identifying ἰδιώτης with ἄπιστος in the context of 1 Cor., we will see that, not only will fellow believers' ἀμήν response contribute to the unity of the assemblies of public worship, but catechumens' saying ἀμήν will contribute to the numerical growth of the church. 14.19 explains that catechumens as well as believers were educated in the church (see. κατηχήσω). For the specific sense of catechetical instruction by the church given to catechumens,

²³⁴ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, p. 651.

²³⁵ S. J. Hafemann, 'Corinthians, Letters to the,' in *DPHL* (G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin, D. G. Reid eds.) (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1993), p. 173.

²³⁶ J. L. Wu, 'Liturgical Elements,' in *DPHL* (G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin, D. G. Reid eds.) (Leicester, England: IVP, 1993), p. 558.

refer to 2 Cl 17.1 ('Let us therefore repent from the whole heart, that no one of us perish by the way. For if we have commandments that we should also practice this, to draw away men from idols and instruct them, how much more ought a soul already knowing God not to perish!').²³⁷

Therefore, the ecclesiological educational system by which catechumens were expected to say ἀμήν to tongues, suggests that the Corinthian believers were determined to educate unbelievers and catechumens in a Christianity immersed in a Jewish context, as they themselves were taught.

6.1.2.2. Categorization of unbelievers into this people in the logic of 14.21-23

Unbelievers will be identified as Jews/gentiles with strong Jewish tendencies like the God fearers in St. Paul's logic reflected in 14.21-23. First of all, what does the expression *this people* of 14.21 indicate, for which St. Paul showed a decided preference for Isa 28.11 LXX to Qumran texts (1QH^a 10.18-19²³⁸; 12.16-17²³⁹)? In the history of the interpretation of Paul's use of Isa 28.11 for the phrase '*this people*' at 1 Cor 14.21, scholars have thus far not fully appreciated it as prospectively identifying unbelievers within the coherent structure of 14.21-23. According to J. N. Oswalt, in the prophet Isaiah, 'this people' has a very negative meaning to the Israelite and it identifies the sense of distance between God and His people.²⁴⁰ J. P. M. Sweet points out that this text (14.20-25) is a difficult problem. Despite its puzzle, he believes that it is evident 14.21 is an anti-Jewish text, but the Apostle Paul applies this anti-Jewish text to the Corinthian church members. His real aim was to change the target from Jews to Corinthians and to blame Corinthians who put glossolalia to wrong use.²⁴¹

²³⁷ Also see. H. W. Beyer, 'κατηχέω,' in *TDNT*, Vol. 3, pp. 638-640.

²³⁸ 'But they have changed them for an uncircumcised lip and a weird tongue of a people without understanding, and so they will be ruined by their mistake.'

²³⁹ They speak to your people with stuttering lip and weird tongue to convert to folly all their deeds with deceit.'

²⁴⁰ J. N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 1-39*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986), p. 513.

²⁴¹ Sweet, 'A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia,' pp. 243,244,246.

Unfortunately, however, most scholars have read 14.20-25 considering 14.22 as the Apostle's logical mistake. As a result, they were unable to find, not only the importance of the linguistic sameness of τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ between Isa 28.11 LXX and 1 Cor 14.21, but the linguistic coherence between τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ of 14.21 and τοῖς ἀπίστοις of 14.22. As such, believers were excluded from this people and scholars, by and large, do not identify the unbelievers as Jewish. Furthermore, the Apostle Paul never called the Corinthian church *this people* but *my people* (2 Cor 6.16). The Corinthian church was described as the temple of God in which God's Spirit dwelt so that they were called *my people* by God (1 Cor 3.16; 2 Cor 6.16; cf. Rom 9.25). In this regard, it sounds illogical that he applies *this people* to the Corinthian church.

This people of 14.21 is identified as the un-baptized (unbelievers and catechumens) of 14.22-23. When Corinthian church members spoke in τὰ πνευματικά unintelligibly through which they told divine wisdom, *this people* listened to the Corinthian church members, like Jews had listened to a divine message through the tongue of the Assyrians in Isa 28.11. It is likely that the reason why St. Paul quoted the law of Isa 28.11 in 1 Cor 14.21 was not only to ascertain that tongues are a sign to unbelievers, but to give priority to Jewish-unbelievers over non-Jewish unbelievers. Accordingly, what identifies unbelievers as *this people* would best be explained as St. Paul's preferential anticipation of Jewish unbelievers who know how to respond to God's word to say ἀμήν.

6.1.3. τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους of 6.4 and catechumens' judgement on what believers said in 14.23

14.20-25 can be understood in connection with the situation of 6.1-11, namely the issue of unbelievers' judgment on believers. Some of the un-baptized look to have had a negative view of affairs which occurred within the Corinthian church (6.4-6; 12.3). Who were those who were least esteemed in the church in 6.4? H. Balz and G. Schneider give a broad definition to the Greek ἐξουθενέω: 'have a low opinion of,

scorn, reject contemptuously.²⁴² The NIV interprets the word as indicating lower-status Christians with an emphasis on the meaning of an imperative. However, as pointed out by R. B. Hays, this idea runs counter to Paul's ecclesiology in which the Church gains the superiority over the world.²⁴³ Therefore, the interpretation of NRSV ('do you appoint as judges those who have no standing in the church'), although it renders the meaning of the phrase τούς ἐξουθενημένους as too slight, seems preferable to the NIV's. A. C. Thiselton categorizes the scholarly interpretation of the word into three: interrogative interpretation, imperative interpretation and indicative exclamatory interpretation. Thiselton's analysis favours the third option. He rightly analyzed 6.4 that 'although the force of the syntax may well be interrogative, the noun may still apply to those (outside) who the church does not regard as esteemed.'²⁴⁴ As explained before,²⁴⁵ however, based on B. A. Pearson maintaining that Paul the Apostle's opponents were influenced by Philo in that their pneumatology showed an analogy with Philo's,²⁴⁶ Thiselton claims that 1 Cor 2.13b-16 'must be regarded as incorporating the terminology of the opponents.'²⁴⁷ In this regard, for the interpretation of 6.4, he is bewildered about the interrogative interpretation and outsiders' being less-esteemed, since he positively evaluates judgment by unbelievers on believers' speech and actions. On the contrary, this thesis suggests reading 2.13-16 as Paul the Apostle's genuine idea which was devised to secure the weak against being manipulated by the strong, as the Corinthian church appointed outsiders as judges. Furthermore, as shown above, the lexical meaning of the word ἐξουθενέω is rendered as 'have a low opinion of', rather than 'have no opinion of'. Thus, it can be rephrased as '(regarding the matter of giving judgment,) those who have a low opinion *in the church* (ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; also see. 1 Cor 12.28; 14.33,34; Eph 3.21; Col 4.16). In this regard, τούς ἐξουθενημένους of 6.4 can be connected to ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ιδιώτου. G. D. Fee comprehends them as outsiders in connection with the situation of a pagan

²⁴² H. Balz and G. Schneider (ed), 'ἐξουθενέω,' in *EDNT*, vol. 2, p. 9.

²⁴³ Hays, *First Corinthians*, p. 94.

²⁴⁴ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 431-433.

²⁴⁵ See. ch. 2 of this thesis.

²⁴⁶ Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians*, pp. 38-39.

²⁴⁷ Thiselton, 'Realized Eschatology at Corinth,' pp. 107-118; *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 252.

court.²⁴⁸ Some depict them as the civil elite such as ‘a Roman proconsul’²⁴⁹ or ‘civil judges.’²⁵⁰ If so, we should perhaps imagine that certain of the civil elite would have been included in catechumens or unbelievers in the Corinthian church. If this is the correct understanding, then at least some of the Corinthian believers appointed as judges those who should have sit in the place of catechumens (14.16), while the Apostle Paul included them amongst the unbelievers (14.22-25).

Regarding the word κριτήριο in 6.2,4, Thiselton, in line with B. S. Rosner,²⁵¹ G. Harris²⁵² and J. D. M. Derrett,²⁵³ seems not to exclude the possibility that the church had an autonomous tribunal for trifling claims (cf. Deut 1.9-17; Exod 18.13-26), even if the place where judgment is rendered was in disorder with an appointment of outsiders to judge.²⁵⁴ Whatever the word κριτήριο in 6.2,4 designates, a pagan court or a tribunal itself, there is a possibility that God-fearers or Jews were on the panel of the tribunal in case of a religious matter.²⁵⁵ Consequently, the unbaptized outside the church in Corinth were potentially Gentiles, God-fearers or Jews; regarding the judgment of spiritual gifts, it seems most likely that Jewish unbelievers were involved, whom St. Paul opposed.

²⁴⁸ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 236.

²⁴⁹ Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 137.

²⁵⁰ J. A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, AB 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 252-253.

²⁵¹ B. S. Rosner, ‘Paul and Moses Appointing Judges. An Antecedent to 1 Cor 6.1-6?’ in *ZNW* 82 (1991), pp. 275-278.

²⁵² G. Harris, ‘Beginnings of Church Discipline: 1 Cor 5,’ *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 1-21.

²⁵³ J. D. M. Derrett, ‘Judgment in 1 Cor 6,’ *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 22-36.

²⁵⁴ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 428-429.

²⁵⁵ As to the word wisdom in 6.5, E. Dinkler suggests a probability that ‘Jewish *hakam*, the scholar a step below the rabbi’ was of one of the un-baptized who could hear cases. Refer to. ‘Zum Problem der Ethik bei Paulus. Rechtsnahme und Rechtsversicht. 1 Kor 6.1-11,’ in *Signum Crucis. Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (Tübingen, 1967), p. 208.

6.2. Well-educated unbelievers and less-educated unbelievers, and their responses as μαίνεσθε

As explained before, 14.20-38 has a structure where 14.23-25 is enclosed with 14.20-22 and 14.26-38 and 14.23-25 is an independent unit. The meaning of 14.23-25 rests in the divisions within the Corinthian church, in which unbelievers were judging what believers said, as shown in the situation of 6.1-11. A conflict between the strong and the weak would have been reflected in unbelievers' judgment on what spoken in tongues by believers. Along with two scenarios of tongues in 1 Cor 14, I will categorize the identity of unbelievers into two: the intellectual class and the less intellectual class; thus, of the unbelievers mentioned in 14.23, such social stratum can be found. If it is correct, it is unlikely that Jewish unbelievers were unanimous in responding to the two possible tongues with the same opinion. If so, the Greek μαίνεσθε will have to be variously interpreted according to the probable identities of tongues and unbelievers.

There is also another problem to be addressed here. According to E. Hiu,²⁵⁶ scholars propose various views on the comment of μαίνεσθε in 14.23 regarding the unbelievers' response: 'religious ecstasy' (by H. Olshausen,²⁵⁷ T. W. Gillespie,²⁵⁸ R. F. Collins²⁵⁹ and A. F. Johnson²⁶⁰); 'demonic possession' (by R. P. Martin²⁶¹); 'something similar to the Hellenistic mystery religions' (by G. D. Fee²⁶² and D. E. Garland²⁶³). R. B. Hays states that unbelievers would have seen religious ecstasy through the Corinthian speaking tongues and considered it a counterpart to the Greco-Roman

²⁵⁶ E. Hiu, *Regulations Concerning Tongues and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians 14.26-40* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), p. 70.

²⁵⁷ H. Olshausen, *Biblical Commentary on St Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1851), p. 228.

²⁵⁸ Gillespie, *The First Theologians: A Study in Early Christian Prophecy*, p. 157.

²⁵⁹ Collins, *First Corinthians*, p. 509.

²⁶⁰ A. F. Johnson, *1 Corinthians*, IVP NTCS (Downers Grove, IL.: IVP, 2004), p. 264.

²⁶¹ Martin, *The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12-15*, p. 73.

²⁶² Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 685.

²⁶³ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, p. 652.

mystery cult such as that of Dionysius or Cybele (Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 4.79).²⁶⁴ D. E. Garland lists additional scholars who have interpreted madness in association with the Hellenistic mystery cult (H. Conzelmann, Smit, Hays, R. Horsley).²⁶⁵ Recently, S. J. Chester understood the Corinthian tongues in relation to prophetic *madness* against the background of ancient Greco-Roman religions (Plato, *Phaedr.* 244A-B). However, this interpretive tendency to explain the Greek *μαίνεσθε* of 1 Cor 14.23 in connection with Hellenistic religions is problematic. First of all, a serious weakness with it, is that it does not explain why 14.23-25 is in contradiction to 14.21-22 and 14.26-38, and catechumens and unbelievers are described as having Jewish identity rather than Gentile identity. Thus, in the pages that follow, it will be argued that the Greek *μαίνεσθε* of 14.23 as a response to two possible types of tongues should be explained against a Jewish background and *μαίνεσθε* will be explained as various according to the unbelievers' identity of well-educated Jewish unbelievers or less educated Jewish unbelievers.

6.2.1. Well-educated unbelievers and *μαίνεσθε*

As explained in the introduction of ch. 6, the Corinthian intellectual unbelievers may be divided into three main sub-groups; wise Jewish unbelievers with the knowledge of Philo might have highly valued the silent tongue; wise Jewish unbelievers aware of *Hodayot* denounced the weird tongue, either with sound or without sound, as accursed on the basis of two *Hodayot*.

The most honorable among the Corinthian unbelievers, with the knowledge of both Philo and *Hodayot*, might be most apt to giving the Greek response *μαίνεσθε* to both possible types of tongues. In case of normal tongue with sound, the most honourable Jewish unbelievers might have judged it to be *μαίνεσθε*. It is likely that they knew that the Corinthian believers were having lawsuits with one another and, what is

²⁶⁴ Hays, *First Corinthians*, pp. 238-239.

²⁶⁵ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 651-652.

worse, depriving a fellow believer of justice and defrauding each other in divisions (6.7-8). They would have thought that it was hypocritical of them to have fellowship at the table all together with such divisions (also see. 11.21-22). St. Paul perhaps thought that this was the reason that the Corinthian church was blamed (1.8). They would have considered the Corinthian church's fellowship at the table as two-faced and, on top of that, when they should have listened to the normal glossolalia spoken by weak believers (14.23), they might have identified it with the weird tongue of two *Hodayot*, described the words of men of deceit or men of Belial or double-minded people. Interestingly, Beliar/Belial is mentioned in 2 Cor 6.15 and identified as Satan. In this regard, the weird tongue spoken by weak believers might have been understood as *μαίνεσθε*, that is, 'out of mind caused by Satan's temptation' by the wisest Jewish unbelievers (1 Cor 7.5; 14.23).

With reference to the Corinthian silent tongue, as they listened to it spoken by strong believers, they might have judged it to be *μαίνεσθε*, namely 'you are inspired.' According to *Hodayot*, the wise reveals God's mysteries and knowledge with strong tongue (1QH^a 26.11-15). Similarly, Philo also introduced God's mysteries and knowledge revealed only by the intellect with prophetic-philosophical speech in silence. Consequently, differently from the case of the normal tongue, they might have responded to the silent tongue as *μαίνεσθε* with what might be termed divine madness upon the intellect (*Heres* 1.14-15,264-265).

However, it is likely that the perfect wisdom introduced by St. Paul was somewhat different from their strong wisdom in interpreting the two possible tongue. St. Paul's *fesin* is depicted as perfect as *ἀγάπη* to build up God's building. His *ἀγάπη* is parallel to faithfulness to the weak. He Christianized the law through the Christianized perfect wisdom by which, whether it is the silent tongue or the noisy tongue, encompassed weird tongues that were supposed to speak to this people (1 Cor 14.21-22; Isa 28.11). In a case of noisy tongue, he might have reinterpreted weirdness 'in Christ' (*ἐν Χριστῷ*) (1.25; 4.10) but in another case of silent tongue, he might have reinterpreted it as weird 'for the sake of Christ' (*διὰ Χριστόν*) (4.10). In

this regard, it is Paul the Apostle's φρεσίν that makes the body of Christ equal and united.

6.2.2. Less-educated God-fearing unbelievers and their response in Jewish and pagan backgrounds

The Apostle said that strong believers should take weak unbelievers' conscience into consideration (9.21-22; 10.28). According to Thiselton, some think that the speaker mentioned in 10.28 would be the host.²⁶⁶ The less-educated unbeliever without liberty is described as one who ought to be treated courteously, as if he or she was a weak believer. According to D. E. Garland, some raise a question as to 'how a non-Christian's conscience could be affected and assume the informer to be a weak Christian who sounds the alarm on another believer.'²⁶⁷ However, considering how he or she used the Greek ἱερόθυτόν rather than εἰδωλόθυτόν preferred by Jews or Christians, it is likely that the informer was a Gentile weak unbeliever. If so, how could the Gentile unbeliever's conscience be affected? It seems a reasonable explanation, if we suppose him or her to be a God-fearer or a Gentile catechumen, who sat in the position of catechumens but had no advanced Jewish or Christian knowledge such as γνῶσις or strong wisdom from a synagogue or the church. For the Apostle Paul, Jews were understood as the unbelieving 'this people' who will be saved in the long run, being positioned between Christian believers and Gentile unbelievers (Rom 8.29²⁶⁸; 9.3; 11.25; 1 Cor 14.21-23).

In the Corinthian church, Gentiles would have held a great majority and among the less-educated unbelievers, the God-fearing, unbaptised catechumens who belonged to honorable and polite society in ancient Graeco-Roman world would have been

²⁶⁶ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 787.

²⁶⁷ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, p. 495.

²⁶⁸ According to the Christianized γνῶσις in 1 Cor 8.4-6, whoever they are, unbelievers are treated as a prospective family (also see. 9.19-22).

regarded as one of the most competent people to judge the Corinthian tongues; along with wise Jewish unbelievers, they would have judged the case of normal glossolalia concluding 'you fell into a prophetic frenzy'²⁶⁹ (1 Sam 10.5,6,10; 19.18-24; 1 Ki 3.15; 22.12; Isa 28.11; cf. Jer 36.26 LXX; Eze 13.2). As they saw the Corinthian strong believers speaking with the Christian universal language, some of them, aware of the universal language found among the Stoics and in ancient magical texts, might have been encouraged to the point of speaking with a universal language (cf. 1 Cor 8.10).

This positive view of the normal tongue can be explained in relation to rapturousness in ancient Israelite prophetic tradition. L. T. Johnson shows that the meaning of glossolalia is consistent with the greater part of the primitive analogous phenomena. In older Israelite prophetic tradition, one might discover a mixture of inspiration by God's Spirit, 'trance-like states with the physical sighs of dissociation,' and the letting out of unintelligible cries (cf. 1 Sam 10.5-13; 19.18-24).²⁷⁰ In this regard, glossolalia could be understood as a phenomenon not dissimilar to ecstasy in the pre-prophetic setting of ancient Israel. Around the 10th century BCE, an age of transition into the establishment of the monarchy, the prophetic phenomenon in the ecstatic state inspired by the Spirit of God appears for the first time in ancient Israelite history. We often find a scene of which an individual or a group fell into ecstatic state by the Spirit on Mount Sinai in the texts of the early monarchy such as 1 Sam 10.5,6,10. Here, the Hebrew verb נָצַח translated as 'in a prophetic frenzy' in NRSV, is used as hithpael (the intensive reflexive) all three times. L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner proved that the hithpael of this verb was mainly used to denote 'to exhibit the behaviour of "to rage"' (Num 11.25-27; 1 Sam 10.5,6,13; 18.10; 19.20-24; 1 Ki 18.29; 22.10; Jer 29.26; 2 Chr 18.9) and 'to talk like a prophet' in the later texts.²⁷¹ W. Gesenius also notes that 'the verb was used in the oldest forms of religious ecstasy with or without song and music but later, essentially religious instruction,

²⁶⁹ Weak unbelievers might probably have wanted to avoid using the expression madness (μανία of Hos 9.7-8 or μαινομαι of Jer 36.26 LXX) which gives a negative impression of prophetic frenzy.

²⁷⁰ Johnson, 'Tongues, Gift of.,' p. 597.

²⁷¹ L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *HALOT*, vol. 2 (New York: E. J. Brill, 1995), p. 659.

with occasional predictions.²⁷² Here, accordingly, this verb expresses shouting and frenzying in the ecstatic state. As inspired by the Spirit of God, Saul and the band of the prophets fell into the ecstatic state (1 Sam 10). For D. J. A. Clines, this prophetic phenomenon of the ecstatic state can be categorized into two in the O.T. in the case of hithpael of נָבֵא: prophecy giving word of Yahweh (1 King 22.8,18; 2 Chr 18.7,17; Jer 26.20; 29.27; Eze 37.10; 2 Chr 20.37) and prophecy giving no word of Yahweh.²⁷³ C. Westermann argues that it is characteristic of words not to be normally given in the ecstatic prophetic phenomenon inspired by the Spirit of God.²⁷⁴

Furthermore, in Jewish rabbinic tradition, both prophecy and wisdom have their origin in Mount Sinai. According to R. Meyer, Aramaean Jishaq (c. 300 B.C.) says that, 'Yet not only did all the prophets receive their prophecy from Sinai but the wise men too who arise from generation to generation-each of them received what he had to say from Sinai.'²⁷⁵ He divides the manifestation of the Spirit on Mount Sinai into two: prophecy with 'irrational, incalculable and often eruptive work of the Spirit' and wisdom with 'the spirit of order, reason and prudence.'²⁷⁶ The God-fearing unbelievers without high-level Jewish or Christian knowledge might have responded to glossolalia with sound in favour of weak unbelievers. On the other hand, in the case of silent tongue, one can imagine their being perplexed at unexpectedly finding tongue in the church as they had no knowledge of tongues in Judaism which is analogous to the universal language of the ancient Graeco-Roman

²⁷² W. Gesenius, *HELOT* (F. Brown ed) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 612.

²⁷³ D. J. A., Clines (ed), *DCH*, vol. 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), p. 583.

²⁷⁴ C. Westermann, 'Geist im Alten Testament,' *ET* 41 (1981), p. 225. Also, refer to J. Behm's saying that 'The ecstatic fervour of the נְבִיאִים who seem to be robbed of their individuality and overpowered by the Spirit (cf. 1S 10.5f.; 19.20f.; also 1 K 18.29f.), finds expression in broken cries and unintelligible speech which might be derided as the babbling of madmen (2K 9.11). Indeed, drunkards can still mock Isaiah's ecstatic babbling of obscure words, and he can give the sharp answer: "Yet verily, with stammering lips and another tongue will Yahweh speak to this people" (Is 28.10f.).' in 'γλώσσα,' in *TDNT*, vol. 1, p. 724.

²⁷⁵ R. Meyer, 'C. Prophecy and Prophets in the Judaism of the Hellenistic-Roman Period in 'προφήτης,' *TDNT*, vol. VI (Friedrick, G. ed) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1968), p. 818.

²⁷⁶ Meyer, 'C. Prophecy and Prophets in the Judaism of the Hellenistic-Roman Period in 'προφήτης,' p. 818.

world. Some of them might have identified it with pagan universal language. They might have misunderstood the Christianized silent tongue as a universal language found in the pagan world (*Aug. De Trinitate* 15.11.20; *Sermones* 180.7.7) and in this case, the Greek *μαίνεσθε* can be interpreted as inspiration based on polytheistic pneumatology rather than based on monotheistic inspiration.²⁷⁷

To sum up, according to the various responses to the two possible types of tongues in Corinth by various unbelievers, it is likely that the Greek *μαίνεσθε* of 1 Cor 14.23 can be variously interpreted.

6.3. Greek unbelievers' responses to the Corinthian two tongues

Surely, 14.21-23 reveals a higher likelihood that Jews were the unbelievers in the case of unfair judgment. Nonetheless, 14.23 shows the Corinthian church's wrong application of tongues might cause chaos, so as a backdrop of the text, we may suppose that a believer's Gentile friend or a Gentile spouse might have judged with Greek wisdom what a believer said in a tongue (1.22; 6.5-6; 7.12-13,18b; 14.23), even if the judgment by unbelievers of second-best identity was far removed from Paul the Apostle's expectation. In this regard, Paul admonished the Corinthian church believers to be careful with a religious matter not to be an offense but to be of benefit to Greeks inclined toward seeking after wisdom as well as Jews throughout the letter in order that they might participate in the gospel and be saved. Thus, it is necessary to see how Greek unbelievers might have judged the two possible types of Corinthian tongues in the chaos of the Corinthian church's unwise application of tongues. The Corinthian Gentile unbelievers' identity can be assumed to be diverse and thus, we may presume that they offered different responses to tongues.

²⁷⁷ Refer to Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language and Civilization*, p. 50.

So far, scholars have tended to focus on explaining unbelievers' response to the normal tongue in relation to the idea of religious rapture or ancient Roman mystery religions. This dissertation will add another plausible explanation, wherein Greek unbelievers' identity is divided into two: unbelievers who preferred Greek speech of Protagoras and unbelievers who acquainted themselves with the sort of philosophical speech in Lucretius. The present work will investigate how both unbelieving groups responded to tongue.

6.3.1. Greek speech in Protagoras

According to C. C. de Jonge and J. M. van Ophuijsen, various words were used for 'language' in ancient Greek.

'What we do find are nouns for speech "sounds and voice" (φωνή) "tongue and tongues" (γλῶσσα) and what is typically alleged to be the most distinctively human capacity: the capacity for articulate speech as the stating of accounts, which is the natural expression and indeed the inseparable companion of discursive reason (λόγος), the obverse of one and the same coin. Later on we find, from the same root and more particularly from the cognate verb for counting, listing, telling, and stating (λαλεῖν),...'²⁷⁸

It is not unreasonable for readers to read 1 Cor 14 with concern about the idea of Greek speech. After all, not only did St. Paul give his mind to Greek unbelievers as he wrote the epistle (1.22,24; 10.32; 12.13), but the idea of philosophical speech was widely known among the wise Jews and Greeks of the day: sounds and voice (φωνή)

²⁷⁸ C. C. de Jonge and J. M. van Ophuijsen, 'Greek Philosophers on Language,' in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (E.J. Bakker ed) (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), p. 485.

in 14.7-8,10-11, tongue and tongues (γλῶσσα) in 14.2,4-6,9,13-14,18-19,21-23,26-27,39, λόγος in 14.9, and λαλεῖν (λαλέω) in 14.2-6,9,11,13,18,19,21,23,27-29,34,35,39.

Furthermore, C. C. de Jonge and J. M. van Ophuijsen explain the relationship between λόγος and νοῦς: 'the tacit understanding between the two organizing principles, reason-cum-speech (λόγος) and intelligence-cum-intellect (νοῦς), one spreading out and articulating, the other contracting and unifying, is Heraclitus' legacy to mainstream ancient Greek metaphysics, and is presupposed by medieval and modern systems betraying its influence.'²⁷⁹ C. C. de Jonge and J. M. van Ophuijsen also point out that among Greek sophists Protagoras emphasized 'speaking correctly' (ὀρθοέπεια). Despite little explanation of what Protagoras meant by this, the evidence of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, *Poetics*, and *Sophistici Enlenchi* (DK 80A27-29) and Diogenes Laertius (DK 80A1,254,13-17), allows us to locate Protagoras' linguistic interests: 'distinctions of gender' and 'different types of speech such as wish, question, answer, and command.'²⁸⁰

It was believed by the Greeks that Greek was the only educated language. They tended to regard all languages but Greek as uncivilized or barbaric. W. V. Harris states that 'throughout the Hellenistic world there was a powerful assumption on the part of the Greeks, well indicated by their strange abstention from learning foreign languages, that what was Greek was best; in fact the assumption may have applied with especial strength to language.' The Greek βάρβαρος frequently meant non-Greek or foreign (A.Pers.255; Hdt.1.58; esp. as to non-Greek language γλῶσσα β. in S.Aj.1263). As a matter of course, through describing barbarians as universally non-intellectual (P.Col.Zen.ii66 in 250s B.C.), the Greeks were disposed to separating themselves from non-Greeks.²⁸¹ What is more, D. L. Gera includes mute sound or a

²⁷⁹ de Jonge and van Ophuijsen, 'Greek Philosophers on Language,' p. 486.

²⁸⁰ de Jonge and van Ophuijsen, 'Greek Philosophers on Language,' pp. 489-490.

²⁸¹ W. V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989), p. 138. Also refer to R. H. Robins, *A Short History of Linguistics* (London: Longman, 1997), p. 15; W. Peremans, 'Égyptiens et étrangers dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque,' *EFH* 8 (1962), pp. 138-140.

language of gesture in uncivilized or primitive languages such as animal language. He thinks that Greeks would have regarded mute sound or an unintelligible language as barbarian language.²⁸²

In this regard, we can imagine that Greek unbelievers who were familiar with Protagoras, would have identified the two possible types of Corinthian tongues with the unsophisticated languages of barbarians (cf. 1 Cor 14.11).

6.3.2. Philosophical discourse in from the golden age to Lucretius

According to the description of Greek speech by C. C. de Jonge and J. M. van Ophuijsen, sound (φωνή) is generally defined as “battered air” (ἀήρ πεπληγμένος). ‘It may be inarticulate or articulate. Articulated sound, which may be written down, is called λέξις, literally, “speaking.” Such λέξις may or may not be meaningful, but “discourse” (once again, λόγος) always is: this is “meaningful sound that is sent forth from the mind” (Diog.Laert.7.55). The “elements” (στοιχεῖα) of λέξις are the letters of the alphabet, whereas the “elements” of λόγος are the “parts of speech.”’²⁸³ They also say that, ‘for the Stoics, λέξις is articulated sound, which may be either meaningless or meaningful.’²⁸⁴

What did the meaningless sound mean among the Stoics? D. L. Gera identifies it as an Adamic language in the golden age that was a namegiving language spoken by wise men who were probably the first kings; the language, which was ‘corrupted, such as the gods’ language in the Cratylus, must be reconstructed if it is to yield up its secrets.’²⁸⁵ A. A. Long, through etymological analysis in philosophical tradition, gives a definition to the incomprehensible language of the Stoics as gods’ names that

²⁸² Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language and Civilization*, pp. 76,188,192,193.

²⁸³ de Jonge and van Ophuijsen, ‘Greek Philosophers on Language,’ p. 494.

²⁸⁴ de Jonge and van Ophuijsen, ‘Greek Philosophers on Language,’ p. 496.

²⁸⁵ Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, language and Civilization*, pp. 25-26.

were revealed only to ancient wise men.²⁸⁶ The philosophical-etymological tradition on gods' names and epithets through which ancient wise men attempted to reveal the true meaning of nature and the world, has been passed down through various texts such as Greek Magical Papyri and Nag Hammadi.

However, D. L. Gera points out that it does not need to identify the universal language described by Stoic thinkers with Adamic golden age language.²⁸⁷ As shown before, a universal language as a philosophical idea of universal conversation was widely known among both Stoic and non-Stoic authors.²⁸⁸ The speech would have been based on a basic, simple, uncomplicated vocalized system. As explained by D. L. Gera, man's primordial language was emotion-centered, 'composed of sounds *voces* rather than (articulated) names of things *nomina rerum*.'²⁸⁹

As shown in ch. 3, Philo describes a special vocalization method by vocal organs such as the lips and tongue through which wise men could pray and sing to God with an unintelligible sound nobody could understand but God. Philo explains a universal language spoken by both animals and men in *Conf* 1.6-8

⁶ And there is also another story akin to this, related by the devisers of fables, concerning the sameness of language existing among animals: for they say that formerly, all the animals in the world, whether land animals, or aquatic ones, or winged ones, had but one language, and that, just as among men Greeks speak the same language as Greeks, and the present race of barbarians speak the same language as barbarians, exactly in the same manner every animal was able to converse with every other animal

²⁸⁶ A. A. Long, 'Stoic linguistics, Plato's Cratylus, and Augustine's De dialectica,' in *Language and Learning: Philosophy of Language in the Hellenistic Age Proceedings of the Ninth Symposium Hellenisticum* (D. Frede and B. Inwood eds.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 36-40.

²⁸⁷ Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language and Civilization*, pp. 35,66.

²⁸⁸ Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language and Civilization*, pp. 18-32,37-38.

²⁸⁹ Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language and Civilization*, p. 38.

with which it might meet, and with which it did anything, or from which it suffered anything, so that they sympathised with one another at their mutual misfortunes, and rejoiced whenever any of them met with any good fortune; ⁷for they could impart their pleasures and their annoyances to one another by their sameness of language, so that they felt pleasure together and pain together; and this similarity of manners and union of feelings lasted, until being sated with the great abundance of good things which they enjoyed, as often happens, they were at last drawn on to a desire of what was unattainable, and even sent an embassy to treat for immortality, requesting to be released from old age, and to be always endowed with the vigor of youth, saying, that already one animal of their body, and that a reptile, the serpent, had received this gift; for he, having put off old age, was allowed again to grow young; and that it was absurd for the more important animals to be left behind by an inferior one, or for their whole body to be distanced by one; ⁸ However, they suffered the punishment suitable to their audacity, for they immediately were separated in their language, so that, from that time forth, they have not been able to understand one another, by reason of the difference in the dialects into which the one common language of them all had been divided.

Philo divides prophetic speech into two: speech with sound (*Quod Deus* 1.84-85; *Heres* 1.14,266) and speech in silence (*Heres* 1.14-16, 266; *Quod Det* 1.92,102; *Conf* 1.6-8,33-39).

As shown before, an analogy of Philo's prophetic speeches was found in Lucretius. Lucretius developed his idea slowly and differently from Philo in a way that he considered un-interpreted, philosophical, meaningless speech as profitless ('those voices... dispersed idly through the breezes' in *De Rerum Natura* 4.568-570; 'I do not pour out my words in the winds' in 931), although he depicted it as if it were as valuable as heavenly speech, which does not look unrelated to an inclination to the "Greekness" of the day. If wise Greek unbelievers at Corinth (see. 1 Cor 1.22) were aware of the philosophical language explained in Lucretius (*muta tamen cum sint, 'dumb though they nevertheless are'* in *De Rerum Natura* 5.1088), they might have

considered the un-interpreted Corinthian silent tongue as futile (cf. τί ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσω in 1 Cor 14.6; also refer to 10.32-33). With respect to the judgment on believers' action if the Corinthian Christians displayed a violent trance state in both two possible tongues (refer to 1 Sam 10.5,6,10 for the normal tongue and *Heres* 1.266 for the silent tongue), they would have judged it to be μαίνεσθε (meaning 'rage' or 'to be furious').

6.4. Conclusion

This thesis has argued that 1 Cor 14.23 should be interpreted in continuity with v. 21-22 rather than vv. 21-22 being explained on the grounds of v. 23. The investigation of reading 14.21-23 in serial order has found that *this people* of 14.21 are to be identified with the plural unbelievers in 14.22-23. The second major finding was that unbelievers' judgment on what is spoken in tongues without interpretation by believers in 14.23, should be read as the Corinthian believers' inappropriate application of gifts, over which the Apostle Paul was deeply concerned. According to these findings, the present study suggests the interpretation of the Greek μαίνεσθε of 1 Cor 14.23 should prioritise a Jewish background and should consider a multiplicity of interpretations concerning μαίνεσθε based on the possible identities of two tongues and of varieties of unbelievers. Furthermore, I discuss, in relation to the two suggestions, how St. Paul worried that unintelligible τὰ πνευματικά might not bear fruit nor build up the church. This research extends our knowledge of the Greek μαίνεσθε of 14.23. The results of this study indicate that within our new structure of 14.20-38, μαίνεσθε is most usefully interpreted, so as to reflect the conflict between the strong and weak believers when tongues-speech was judged by unbelievers.

However, this study is limited by the lack of information on a close connection between *this people* and *catechumens and unbelievers*, and by the lack of more clear and

detailed knowledge of unbelievers' categorization into two (well-educated and less-educated), and the predominance of Jewishness within the Corinthian church. In addition to that, the scope of this study is limited in terms of the previous investigation of silent speech in the ancient Mediterranean religious world. More broadly, research is also needed to determine close analogies between tongues in the Jewish-Christian world and those in the Graeco-Roman world. In the next chapter, the key issue on unbelievers judging Christians in relation to prophecy described in 14.24-25 will be discussed.

7. ἀγάπη and τὰ πνευματικά, and Paul the Apostle's genuine idea of the application of prophecy

Previously, scholars have argued that 1 Cor 14.24-25 showed the appropriate application of prophecy due to its intelligibility as opposed to the wrong application of tongues in 14.23; I wish to present another possible reading of 14.24-25- that is, wrong application of prophecy within our extended structure of 14.20-38. I will argue the following: there is a contradiction between 'all prophesy and no one to weigh what is said among believers' in 14.24-25 and 'two or three prophesy and the others weigh what is said' in 14.29; there is a contradiction between the excessive harsh judgment by all the Corinthian prophets in 14.24-25 (cf. 6.5-7) and Paul the Apostle's exhortation to apply prophecy on humanitarian grounds in 4.3-5, 6.5 and 14.3,29; there is a contradiction between an unbeliever's weighing what believers said in 14.25 and Paul the Apostle's appeal to the Corinthian believers to have their words weighed only by fellow believers in 2.12-16; 6.1f.; 14.29).

The Corinthian believers' wrong application of prophecy being puffed up with jealousy and antagonism is contradictory to St. Paul's ecclesiological concept of ἀγάπη. Being puffed up would suggest that it was jealousy that made them unwilling to give way to fellow believers when they had prophecy in the public worship: this is the reason why all prophesied in the church (14.24). Their being puffed up led to hostility between each other (4.6), so that the Corinthian church members used prophecy to severely judge the unbeliever (14.24-25). However, it is ἀγάπη that is not jealous and puffed up (οὐ ζηλοῖ, ... οὐ φυσιοῦται in 13.4). There appear to be two directly opposed ideas of God in our epistle. One is revealed by a wise unbeliever in 14.24-25, whose weighing bestows praise on some strong believers with γνῶσις for their application of prophecy, by which they disclose even the hidden things of the unbelievers' hearts. Alternatively, another view of God introduced by the Apostle Paul would commend those who have not judged anyone/anything (4.5). The commendation is consistent with a reward given to those who build up God's building with ἀγάπη on the foundation of Jesus Christ (3.10-14).

γνώσις that 'there is no God but one' puffs up, while ἀγάπη builds up God's building, which is explained as being patient and kind (13.4). In addition, ἀγάπη believes all things (πάντα πιστεύει in 13.7). The Corinthian believers' application of prophecy based on γνώσις is lawful, but does not build up (10.23).

Next, the Corinthian believers' wrong application of prophecy described in 14.24-25, which shows the serious problem of splits between the strong and the weak, is opposed to a virtue of faithfulness rooted in St. Paul's ecclesiological idea of τὰ πνευματικά. γνώσις would have brought about schism between the strong and the weak. In the split caused by the antagonistic arrogance rooted in γνώσις, strong believers would have conspired against weak believers to marginalize them in the assembly, when the wise unbeliever heard strong believers' superior prophecy with γνώσις and paid them a high compliment (ὄντως ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστὶ in 14.25; also refer to 6.1f.). Christian morality expressed through τὰ πνευματικά, which St. Paul describes as the Christianized greater gifts (2.6-14; 12.31; 14.1), is explained as faithfulness between believers where weak believers are sheltered by strong believers. The Apostle Paul along with his co-workers spoke τὰ πνευματικά at Corinth (2.13) and it is described as that which should be judged together by people of the Spirit (συγκρίνοντες in 2.13; also comp. between εἰς διεορμηνεύτω in 14.27 and οἱ ἄλλοι διακρινέτωσαν in 14.29). The Corinthian believers received τὰ πνευματικά the Apostle Paul had sown in (9.11), but they did not grow into adulthood in Christian spirituality so that they spoke and thought like a child pretending not to receive τὰ πνευματικά (3.1f.; 13.11; 14.20). Due to their immaturity in the Christianized perfect wisdom (13.12; 14.20), it is likely that what weak believers spoke was vulnerable to judgment from a wise Jew, as if they were students of a tutoring guardian (ὁ παιδαγωγός).

In conclusion, interpreting 14.24-25 as St. Paul's worry over the Corinthians' wrong application of prophecy in the enlarged structure of 14.20-38 is more likely to be right than interpreting 14.24-25 in the structure of 14.20-25, as a positive application of prophecy.

7.1. ἀγάπη and τὰ πνευματικά as Paul the Apostle's pictorial images of the church

7.1.1. Problems within the Corinthian church

The Greek ἐκκλησία occurs nine times in ch 14 (14.4,5,12,19,23,28,33,34,35). The expression, 'the church of God' frequently appears in the NT (1 Cor 1.2; 10.32; 11.22; 15.9; 2 Cor 1.1; Gal 1.13; plural in 1 Cor 1.16,22; 1 Th 2.14; 2 Th 1.4; 1 Tim 3.15; Ac 20.28) and Paul used it eleven times and by far most times of for the Corinthian church (seven times). P. T. O'Brien states that the expression is not only 'the self-designation of the early Jerusalem church' (1 Cor 15.9; cf. Gal 1.13; Ph 3.6), but also referred to other assemblies inclusive of the Gentile mission.²⁹⁰ D. Horrell, using J. C. Beker's term, remarked that 'Paul is a theocentric theologian whose thought is centred around the conviction that God has acted in Christ in a final and decisive manner, and that the final triumph of God is now eagerly awaited.'²⁹¹ Paul introduces the Corinthian church as 'the church of God' in 1 Cor 1.2; 10.32; 11.22. Compared to Rom 12.5, Eph 4.15, 5.23 and Col 1.18, 1 Cor 3.22-23 and 11.3 emphasize that only God is the Patron for His churches (8.1-6). Thus, in 3.22-23 and 11.3, God is depicted as the roof of St. Paul's building ecclesiology. Under the roof, it is only God that makes the church grow up (3.7) and only by the love of God, will His house be built up (8.1).

There have been attempts to describe the images of the church in our epistle as the temple or the body.²⁹² So far, however, there has been little discussion about God's field and God's building as Pauline ecclesiological images in 1 Cor. St. Paul portrays the church of God variously as 'the field of God' and 'the house of God' under construction and co-working with fellow workers (3.9). The church of God equipped

²⁹⁰ P. T. O'Brien, 'Church,' in *DPHL* (G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin, and D. G. Reid eds) (Leicester, England: IVP, 1993), p. 126.

²⁹¹ D. G. Horrell, *An Introduction to the Study of Paul* (London: T&T Clark, 2000), p. 67. Also see J. C. Beker, *Paul the Apostle* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980), pp. 21-24, 115, 362-367.

²⁹² Refer to O'Brien, 'Church' in *DPHL*, pp. 126-128.

with various workers (1.12; 3.4-23) and in accordance with that, diversification in gifts, services and activities by the various workers coexisted under one roof (12.4-6).

According to S. J. Hafemann, G. Fee seeing that an “apologetic” tone is hidden all round problems behind 1 Corinthians argues that ‘the historical situation behind 1 Corinthians is fundamentally one of conflict between Paul and the church as a whole, in which the Corinthians’ rejection of Paul’s authority as the founder of the church is perceived to be at the heart of their troubles.’²⁹³ With respect to the issue of the diversity of the gifts and divisiveness, G. D. Fee argues that 12.4-6 explains God as the source of the varieties of gifts rather than different valuations on gifts reflected in divisiveness within the church.²⁹⁴ Accordingly, Fee seems to have suggested comprehending St. Paul’s request for unity in diversity as ‘apologetic.’

On the contrary, S. J. Hafemann believes that St. Paul’s general tone in 1 Corinthians is didactic in preference to apologetic and no found conflict between St. Paul and the church.²⁹⁵ It has been suggested by D. B. Martin that the divisions in the church were reflected in the diversification.²⁹⁶ Moreover, most scholars tend to identify the Corinthian elitist talk of πνευματικῶν or χαρίσματα with glossolalia and depict St. Paul’s attitude of that as “baby talk”.

However, assuming that the Corinthian prophetesses practiced prophecy in a way opposed to Pauline principle (14.24-25), I believe that there was considerable conflict between them and the Apostle Paul. On this assumption, it is unlikely that 14.22 should be understood as Paul the Apostle’s mistake within the structure of 14.20-25. Rather, it is likely that 14.22 is St. Paul’s wisdom to cure the wrong application of

²⁹³ Hafemann, ‘Corinthians, Letters to the,’ p. 174.

²⁹⁴ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 582-586. Also see G. Wright, ‘Diversity in the Church,’ *TE* 14 (1983), pp. 64-68.

²⁹⁵ Hafemann, ‘Corinthians, Letters to the,’ p. 174.

²⁹⁶ D. B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 87.

gifts by the Corinthian church shown in 14.23-25, by which they practiced prophecy for judging, even going beyond the limits. With everyone prophesying, unbelievers were pronouncing judgment on believers' prophetic utterances, so bringing to fruition the prophetesses' wicked scheme to marginalize the weak.

Admittedly, though most scholars regard the Corinthian use of prophecy as adult talk, opposed to glossolalia, this thesis suggests that St. Paul would have regarded both glossolalia and prophecy practiced by the Corinthian church as baby talk. First of all, the maturity of the Corinthian church to understand τὰ πνευματικά the Apostle Paul has sown was at 'baby level' and they were still σαρκικοί (3.1-3). As shown before, they had problems with jealousy (3.3; also see. 13.4), antagonistic puffing up (4.6; also see 4.18-19; 5.2; 8.1; 13.4), divisions (σχίσμα in 11.18), infectious boasting (5.6; also see. 1.29,31; 3.21; 4.7; 13.3,4; cf. 9.15-16; 15.31) and strife (ἔρις in 1.11; 3.3). Their childish foolishness caused particular problems with jealousy, antagonistic arrogance and splits in the application of prophecy.

First, let us first consider jealousy in the community. The Apostle Paul portrays the church of God as a field and a house/a building(3.9) in which there are "varieties of gifts" (Διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων in 12.4) that are granted to "people of the Spirit" (πνευματικοῖς in 2.13; 3.1; also see. 12.7-11) by "one Spirit" (ἐνὶ πνεύματι in 12.13; also see. 12.4,11), "varieties of services" (διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν in 12.5) that are assigned to "servants" (διάκονοι in 3.5) by "one Lord" (εἷς κύριος in 8.6; also see. 3.5; 12.5) and varieties of activities (διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων in 12.6) that are activated by "one God" (εἷς θεός in 8.6; also see. 12.6) through "God's fellow-workers" (Θεοῦ...συνεργοὶ in 3.9). In spite of diverse gifts, services, and activities, and the superiority or inferiority between them, Paul the Apostle's argument here is that the church can form only one body, in a Christ centred, universal theo-ecclesiology by ἀγάπη. This ἀγάπη is directed towards God and one another (ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν in 2.9), because ἀγάπη builds up God's church (8.1). However, their lack of ἀγάπη becomes parallel to a shortage of gifts. The limited variety of gifts reflects internal trouble in the church. They were jealous so that, not only did not they make room for fellow believers to prophesy, but they were unwilling to

weigh what fellow believers prophesied. This is the reason that they all prophesied in the church (14.24) and did not help believing friends with weighing what is said.

I will now consider the issue of hostile “puffing up” and splits. During the Apostle Paul and his co-worker Apollos’ absence from Corinth, the Corinthian church fell into boasting and being puffed. Antagonistic haughtiness was added to contagious boasting (see. 4.6-7; 13.4). The more boasting leavened the whole church (5.6), the more puffed up they were and the more hostile they were toward each other (4.6-8). It would have led to the atmosphere in the church being highly charged. Furthermore, puffing up with γνῶσις would have split the church into two: strong and weak (8.1,7; 11.18f.). In this situation, strong believers intended that through unbeliever’s judgment on believers’ speaking and actions, on the one hand they would be weighed in what they prophesied and be built up, but on the other weak believers would be marginalized. This was, of course, opposed to Paul the Apostle’s principle given to the church that τὰ πνευματικά were supposed to be judged and weighed by fellow believers for building up God’s building (2.13-16; 14.29).

Paul devised his building and agricultural ideas based on his ecclesiology, in order to deal with the problem of friction within the Corinthian church. He appeals for unity, not through standardisation of gift that all prophesy but through diversification of gifts such as prophecy, weighing what is said, disclosure, knowledge and teaching. This is based on a Christian morality of ἀγάπη and emphasizes equality between social strata.

7.1.2. ἀγάπη as a Christian morality for building up God’s building

The Apostle Paul uses the image of a building for the church of God. To edify the building, Paul’s main work as a skilled master-builder was to lay a foundation (θεμέλιον ἔθηκα in 3.10). The church’s work was to construct the house by laying bricks on this foundation (ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδομεῖ in 3.10). The image of the building built up by the other workers is portrayed as though God, as a main worker, formed

one body by placing each member in each part of the body (ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο in 12.18,28) and blended/united the body by giving the greater honour to the inferior member.

To be more precise, according to the Apostle Paul, to “build up” (οἰκοδομέω) God’s house/building is the work of God (θεοῦ ἔσμεν συνεργοί...θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε in 3.9). Those who lay a foundation are considered as God’s workers (3.9-11). The work of the others, namely to build up God’s building on the foundation (τὸ ἔργον...ὁ ἐποικοδόμησεν in 3.14) should be as “perfect” (τέλειος in 13.10-12; 14.20) as the work of God (3.10,14), but if not, their work will be burned up and it will fall down (3.12-15). To build up God’s building is explained as such in 3.9-15. Moreover, God’s building is portrayed as the church (ἐκκλησίαν οἰκοδομεῖ in 14.4; ἡ ἐκκλησία οἰκοδομὴν λάβη in 14.5; τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας in 14.12), and varieties of workers can build up God’s church with varieties of gifts (12.4-6; 14.26). “The work of God” (3.9-15; 12.6), by which the other workers build up God’s building by placing a brick on the foundation (3.14), is depicted as if God has placed the members in the body (ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο τὰ μέλη, ἐν ἑκάστων αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ σώματι καθὼς ἠθέλησεν in 12.18; ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ in 12.28). As such, the list of construction materials in 3.12 can be compared to the list in 12.28. According to Thiselton, scholars (Karl Maly, David Kuck) who make efforts to find the image of God’s temple in 3.12-13 are perplexed about the reason why hay and straw are added to the list.²⁹⁷ Thiselton, in support of F. Lang, who believes ‘a non-specific analogy’ for the image in 3.12-13, mentions that ‘the “testing by fire” connected with the last judgment simply underlines the subsidiary but important point which Paul elaborates in 4:4 and 5, that such is the opaqueness and duplicity of the human heart that even the builders of authentic work will not know definitively “how they build” until God’s own definitive verdict declares this and it becomes publicly visible at the last judgment.’²⁹⁸ However, St. Paul emphatically says that ἀγάπη builds up (8.1) and never falls down (Ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε πίπτει in 13.8) so that the building built with ἀγάπη will endure the test of fire. This is the reason why ἀγάπη is described as the way of primary importance (12.31; 13.13).

²⁹⁷ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 311.

²⁹⁸ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 312; also see. F. Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, NTD 7 (Göttingen and Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), p. 53.

ἀγάπη is not jealous (13.4). Should there be superiority or inferiority between varieties of gifts in God's field, the same will be true between varieties of services building up God's building. Even if it looks uncertain as to whether St. Peter has visited Corinth and his influence at Corinth made his party in the church, his position as a greater Apostle than St. Paul is suggested in 9.5 and 15.3-9.²⁹⁹ However, St. Paul's argument is that even if a building is built up by the use of superior materials, it will not be enough to endure the test of fire, regardless of the status of the Apostle; if he builds up God's building with materials other than ἀγάπη, his work will be in vain. On the contrary, even an Apostle regarded as less authoritative will be treated the same as the greatest Apostle, insofar as his work amount to be profitable to build up the church corresponding to ἀγάπη. In the same way, tongues will be equal to prophecy as long as there is interpretation.

In addition to that, ἀγάπη is not puffed up on behalf of oneself or antagonistic towards another (4.6; 13.4). γνῶσις puffs up, while ἀγάπη builds up. Even though γνῶσις is lawful, it is imperfect, because it is not profitable for building up the church (10.23; 13.9). In this regard, judgment based on γνῶσις could be contradictory to that based on ἀγάπη in the situation of the Corinthian church. It has a thread of connection with St. Paul's guiding principle on how to use a tribunal; in such meetings, they were exhorted not to judge anything until the second coming of the Lord rather than judge foolishly (4.5; cf. Rom 2.16). That is, judgment was to be meted out in humanitarian fashion, based on a Christian ἀγάπη inspired moral code.

In sum, Paul employs the ecclesiological images of field and building/a house in ch. 14. τὰ πνευματικά is described as a Pauline agricultural-ecclesiological image of which prophecy is portrayed as one of the seeds St. Paul sowed in God's field. Establishing a link between ἀγάπη in 14.1a and οἰκοδομή and οἰκοδομέω in 14.3,4,5,12,17,26, shows a Pauline constructional-ecclesiological image, in which, for Paul, speaking both prophecy and *mysteries* should be based upon ἀγάπη (13.2).

²⁹⁹ Regarding the issue of St. Peter's visiting to Corinth, refer to Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 57-58.

‘ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, οὐθέν εἰμί’ in 13.2 and ‘ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦμαι’ in 13.3 are connected to ‘τί ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσω;’ in 14.6. Prophecy is explained as encouragement (14.3,31) and consolation (14.3). The Apostle Paul emphasizes how to use the gift of prophecy he sowed in God’s field, through paralleling ‘ἀγάπη builds up’ in 8.1 with ‘prophecy builds up’ in 14.3,4. In this regard, encouragement and consolation (παράκλησιν καὶ παραμυθίαν) in 14.3 show the humane application of prophecy within the situation of divisions in the church based on ἀγάπη.

However, there was something wrong with the Corinthians whose application of prophecy shows jealousy and ruthless judgment. Even though prophecy is superior to tongues, it will be akin to foolishness as opposed to “perfect/complete wisdom in Christ” (ταῖς φρεσὶν τέλειοι γίνεσθε in 14.20; ὑμεῖς δὲ φρόνιμοι ἐν χριστῷ in 4.10), if all the Corinthian believers prophesy and an unbeliever should be reproved and judged by all believers. In this Corinthian situation, perfect wisdom in Christ is clear: building up the church with ἀγάπη.

7.1.3. Faithfulness as a Christian morality for unifying the body into one in variety of τὰ πνευματικά sown in God’s field

Another way looking at the image of Pauline ecclesiology is God’s field. The Apostle Paul depicts his second ecclesiological image with agricultural or arboricultural language within our epistle. In St. Paul’s description, God is faithful in the way that He calls saints into fellowship with His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord (1.9). God is the main worker in His field and He requires faithfulness from his co-workers as He is (1.9; 4.2,17; 10.13). As the Lord’s servants, Apollos and Paul provided God’s field the service of cultivation, in which the Apostle Paul depicts himself and his fellow workers as ploughmen (9.10). A work of a ridge is assigned to Paul (3.6; 9.7; 9.11; 14.1) and a work of a furrow is assigned to Apollos (3.6; cf. 10.4; 12.13). Paul planted and Apollos watered (3.6-8). In this way, they showed a fine example of faithfulness as a Christian virtue in God’s field (4.6).

τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν of 2.12 is identified as τὰ πνευματικά (the seeds of the Spirit) sown in God's field. According to G. D. Fee, some (Chevallier, Baker, and Martin) argue that a Greek πνευματικά has been substituted for the Corinthian word χαρίσματα, designating the gifts of the Spirit. However, Fee called this argument into question, for πνευματικός is also the Corinthian word and variations of πνευματικὸς appear not to have been exclusively possessed by St. Paul.³⁰⁰ Key to our discussion, however, is the proper understanding of the Greek τὰ πνευματικά. E. E. Ellis pointed out that in Paul's writings both χαρίσματα and πνευματικά designate the gifts of the Spirit but each application is different. The former signifies all of the gifts, whilst the latter should be limited to 'gifts of inspired perception, verbal proclamation and/or its interpretation.' Regarding πνευματικά, based on Schweizer's idea that 'πνευματικός is the broader concept of which προφήτης is a special type,'³⁰¹ he believes that the word is designed to express inspired speech such as 'a hymn, a teaching (διδαχήν), a revelation, a tongue or an interpretation.'³⁰²

On the one hand, the grace of God is emphasized in τὰ χαρισθέντα of 2.12 or τὰ χαρίσματα of 12.31. On the other hand, in τὰ πνευματικά, the Spirit is emphasized as the Spirit of the Lord which forms unity in diversity (10.3,4; 12.4-11,13). The Apostle Paul along with his co-worker(s) spoke what was given to them by the grace of God, through which the testimony of Christ has been strengthened in the church (1.6; 2.12; 8.1). The variety of the gifts of the Spirit is emphasized in τῶν πνευματικῶν (12.1; also see. Διαιώσεις χαρισμάτων in 12.4; διαιώσεις διακονιῶν in 12.5; διαιώσεις ἐνεργημάτων in 12.6), in which superiority or inferiority between gifts might be found (12.14-30; 14.1-19). In addition to that, the Apostle Paul mentions ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα (strive for the greater gifts) in 12.31, which has a linguistic similarity with ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά in 14.1 and

³⁰⁰ G. D. Fee, 'Gifts of the Spirit,' *DPHL* (G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin, and D. G. Reid eds.) (Leicester, England: IVP, 1993), p. 341; *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 624, n. 39.

³⁰¹ E. Schweizer, 'πνεῦμα, πνευματικός,' *TDNT*, vol. 6 (G. Friedrich ed) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1968), p. 423.

³⁰² E. E. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1978), pp. 24-25.

ζηλοῦτε τὸ προφητεύειν in 14.39. Through this, we can learn that there might be superiority and inferiority in τὰ πνευματικά.

Notably, what Ellis fails to do is draw any attention to the fact that the Apostle Paul dramatically identifies τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα of 12.31 with τὰ πνευματικά of 14.1 through ζηλοῦτε. In this loose connection between the two, it is likely that St. Paul emphasizes *faithfulness* as Christian morality focusing on how to unify the body into one, in diversity, with superiority and inferiority among gifts and in relation to the application of the gifts of the Spirit in the church. Differently from the Corinthian church's grading of gifts, Paul the Apostle explains the criterion for the hierarchy of gifts (see. τὰ μείζονα and καθ' ὑπερβολήν in 12.31) according to the level of contribution to building up God's building based on ἀγάπη in 14.1-19. In 14.20-38, Corinthian Christian morality is emphasized with Paul's wisdom of φρεσίν to keep the weak safe against being despised by the strong members' manipulation; this ensues when what was spoken by believers were judged by outsiders. The expression καθ' ὑπερβολήν of 12.31 is re-expressed as κατὰ δύο ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τρεῖς καὶ ἀνὰ μέρος in 14.27, δύο ἢ τρεῖς λαλείτωσαν in 14.29 and καθ' ἓνα in 14.31, over and against the Corinthians' misapplication of gifts ('all speak in tongues' in 14.23 and 'all prophesy' in 14.24). In this way, Paul emphasizes that the divided church will not be united until what is spoken with various gifts received by the grace of God is approved by fellow believers in faithful fellowship that does not marginalize the weak.

In addition, 14.1a captures the entire ch. 14 in which τὰ πνευματικά comes to have a close connection with a Christian morality of ἀγάπη ('ἀγάπη does not seek my own advantage but that of many in 10.24,33; 13.5). τὰ πνευματικά sown on a ridge in God's field by St. Paul is identified with the greater gifts in connection with ζηλοῦτε (12.31; 14.1,39), which is explained as superior to unintelligibly inspired gifts in ch. 14.³⁰³ The phrase 'ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα' in 12.31 is re-expressed as

³⁰³ Regarding the identifying of greater gifts in 12.31 with τὰ πνευματικά in 14.1 through ζηλοῦτε, refer to Gillespie, *The First Theologians*, pp. 129-130; Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity*, p. 24. On the contrary this argument is opposed by Conzelmann (1

‘ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον… μᾶλλον’ in 14.1-5, in which 14.1b-5a is bracketed with the repetition of the expression: μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε. The emphasis on prophecy for building up the church at worship re-appears in the conclusion of the chapter (v. 39): ζηλοῦτε τὸ προφητεύειν. What is more, Ellis’ theory would have been far more persuasive, if he had considered R. Meyer’s theory a more significant foundation for understanding the relation between τὰ πνευματικά and prophecy than Schweizer’s. Meyer remarks that the Synagogue would have been ‘strongly dominated by nomistic rationalism’ when the prophetic tradition of the post-exilic Judaism had to be replaced by a nomistic rationalism since the death of Herod and the overthrow of the hierocracy, in which, not only have Israelite prophetic charismatics encountered the wisdom tradition but also Pharisaic Rabbinism founded on nomistic nationalism has emerged.³⁰⁴ If so, this combination of findings will provide some support for the conceptual premise that in order to build up the church with intelligible gifts, St. Paul would have given consideration not only to fellow believers but to Jews or God-fearers. If such Jewish or God-fearing unbelievers or catechumens came to the Corinthian church from the synagogue and listened what believers said with intelligible gifts, their mind (νοῦς) would have been fruitful through the prophetic manifestations of nomistic rationalism (14.14).

What should the Corinthian church have done with the gifts of the Spirit for God’s activities? As explained before, Paul and Apollos are introduced as the Lord’s servants (διάκονοι…ὁ κύριος in 3.5) and ‘God’s fellow-workers’ (θεοῦ…συνεργοὶ in 3.9) for the church. Paul admonishes them that their labor (κόπον) should not be in vain (3.8; 15.10,58) or unfruitful (ἄκαρπός in 14.14), but their services to the Lord and activities of God be “increased” (αὐξάνω in 3.6-7; cf. 3.13-15; 12.5-6; 15.58) and “fruitful” (καρπός in 9.7). Varieties of gifts are, without a doubt, for the profit of the church, in pursuit of love (ἀγάπη), not so much by seeking personal profit, but by

Corinthians, p. 233) for whom τὰ πνευματικά in 14.1 is newly confined to mean tongues and prophecy.

³⁰⁴ Meyer, ‘C. Prophecy and Prophets in the Judaism of the Hellenistic-Roman Period,’ in ‘προφήτης,’ pp. 818,828.

seeking the profit of many. In this regard, God's activities through the seeds of the Spirit are expected to bear abundant fruit (14.14). However, not so with respect to glossolalia in the hope of a ploughmen due to its unintelligibility, even though it surely is a gift of the Spirit speaking the word of the Lord (14.21). In other words, tongues are portrayed as inferior to intelligible speech, in spite of being included in *χαρίσματα* or *πνευματικά*. As long as tongues can produce fruit through interpretation, they will be as profitable for God's field as prophecy is (14.5b; cf. 12.22-24). St. Paul's message is plainer in ch. 14, that the Corinthians are required to exercise self-control to make a faithful fellowship no matter how great the tongues and prophecy they are equipped with. Otherwise the ploughman's labour becomes futile and even the Apostle does not make full use of his rights, so that he may cause no hindrance to the gospel of Christ. Accordingly, St. Paul exhorts the Corinthian church to form unity and equalize the body of Christ between social strata, not through standardization of gifts- all speaking in tongues or all prophesying- but, through diversification of gifts such as tongues and interpretation, prophecy and weighing what is said and disclosure based on a Christian morality of *faithfulness* in a connection with *ἀγάπη* for the benefit of the church (refer to 14.20f.).

7.2. Paul the Apostle's idea of the proper application of prophecy in relation to judgment

The "if" clause in 14.24 (if all prophesy) reflects St. Paul's worry about the wrong application of prophecy. The anxiety takes concrete shape in two aspects: believers' application of prophecy to *ἀνακρίνω* and an unbeliever's weighing what is prophesied by a believer.

7.2.1. Believers' application of prophecy to ἀνακρίνω in opposition to ἀγάπη

With respect to the way the Corinthians prophesied which is shown in 14.24-25, little question has been raised by most scholars. A. C. Thiselton also understands the application of prophecy described in 14.24-25 as a paradigm of applying the gift. He views the Greek πάντες here as impressionistic rather than numerical and understands the response of τις ἄπιστος (someone who is an unbeliever) to the Corinthian prophecy St. Paul describes as, 'a projected possible scenario.' He tries to find the meaning of the words ἐλέγχεται and ἀνακρίνεται in accordance with their wider use in the NT, especially the Fourth Gospel, rather than 1 Corinthians itself.³⁰⁵

Although Thiselton's approach is the most comprehensive account of the application of prophecy described in 14.24-25 produced so far, it does suffer from a number of flaws. Firstly, his reading is incompatible not only with 14.22b ('prophecy is a sign not to unbelievers but to believers'), but also with the second part of the second section (14.29-31) (*two or three* prophets should speak in order to receive judgment on the application of the gift from fellow believers). In this regard, 14.24-25 is isolated in the structure of the second part (vv. 20-38).

Secondly, Greek words ἐλέγχεται and ἀνακρίνεται should be explained in coherence within 1 Corinthians. ἐλέγχω is a *hapax legomenon* in the Pauline epistles, whilst there appear variants of the Greek κρίνω: κρίμα (6.7; 11.29,34), κρίνω (4.5; 5.3,12-13; 6.1-3,6; 7.37; 10.15,29; 11.13,32;), ἀνακρίνω (2.14-15; 4.3-4; 9.3; 10.25,27; 14.24), διακρίνω (4.7; 6.5; 11.29,31; 12.10; 14.29) and κατακρίνω (11.32). These show a basic principle in the church in relation to the application of judgment.

Regarding Greek words κρίμα and κρίνω, it is likely that the Corinthian church had 'a tribunal for small claims' ('ἀνάξιοι ἔστε κριτηρίων ἐλαχίστων;' in 6.2) that

³⁰⁵ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1127-1128.

happened in everyday life (μήτι γε βιωτικά in 6.3). Instructions given to the church by the Apostle Paul were as follows. Firstly, all the speech uttered in the church should have been judged by believers (2.13-15; 10.15). Secondly, regarding judging people, believers can judge the world (6.2) and the wicked people (5.3,12-13). As to the problem of judging between believers, St. Paul never suggested that they should have used the tribunal to judge sides, rather it would be better to be wronged and defrauded (6.7), unless there was a wise believer who could prove his believing friend's innocence (6.5). In the instance that no wise believer could be found to judge cases between believers, it represented a total moral defeat. As such, it would be a stumbling block for him or her to take part in the table of the Lord (11.28-34). All these directions are given for the Corinthian church lest their meeting should fall under judgment (11.34).

In this regard, St. Paul's guiding principle for the disunited and loveless church shown in 4.5, that they should not judge the hidden things of darkness in their heart until the coming of Lord (4.5; Rom 2.16), emphasizes the necessity of self-control against excessive judgment each other. In other words, according to an ecclesiological moral teaching by St. Paul, even if they had a device for judgment within the church, the device should not have been applied enough to defeat a fellow believer's morality. The Apostle Paul appealed to the Corinthians rather to leave it to the Lord of the Last Day to judge, for building up the church with ἀγάπη.

A compound word 'ἀνακρίνω' of ἀνα ('each' in the distributive sense; cf. Matt 20.9,10)³⁰⁶ and κρίνω (to judge) more clearly displays a backdrop to divisions in the Corinthian church, in which they bitterly denounced each other. This not only brought disgrace on the glory of the Apostle and the saints (see. 2.7; 11.7; 2 Cor 4.6; 8.23), but posed an obstruction to building up the church and forced Paul to defend himself against the inevitable criticism for the sake of building them up (1 Cor 9.3; 2 Cor 12.19). What should have been examined was τὰ πνευματικά rather than fellow

³⁰⁶ G. Schneider, 'ἀνά,' in *EDNT*, vol. 1 (H. Balz and G. Schneider eds.) (Michigan: Eerdmans, 1990), p. 74.

believers (2.13-14). Those who endlessly examine fellow believers belong to ψυχικός but the person of the Spirit (ὁ πνευματικός) can examine (ἀνακρίνω) all the things of the Spirit. The body of Christ should be examined by nobody (2.15; 10.25-29); wise believers do not examine the things hidden in darkness of others' heart but hidden the things of the Spirit which God marked out beforehand, before the ages, for the glory of saints, in order not to be practiced with imperfect wisdom at the public worship.

The Greek 'διακρίνω' is also a compound word of δια ('on account of' in the form with the accusative in 4.7; 6.5; 11.29,31 and 'through or throughout' in the form with the genitive in 12.10; 14.29)³⁰⁷ and κρίνω (to judge). St. Paul suggests his pastoral solution with the word 'διακρίνω' under the circumstances that the Corinthians had a matter with each other. Furthermore, their application of prophecy shows wisdom as inferior to the Pauline wisdom of τὰ πνευματικά. As such, they would eat and drink 'judgment'³⁰⁸, if they ate and drank without 'weighing between believers (διακρίναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ in 6.5) for the sake of believers' participation in the table of the Lord' (11.29). That an accusative is accompanied by the word διακρίνω in 4.7; 6.5; 11.29,31 it seems the emphasis is on the translation of the prefix δια into 'on account of.' If this is the correct understanding, it is likely that it explains their eating and drinking judgment against themselves at the Lord's Supper (11.28-34). The Apostle emphasizes a desperate need for a wise believer who can weigh what is said for the sake of a fellow believer (διακρίνω), when there is a matter between believers. Simultaneously what is said by ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος, who do not receive the things of the Spirit, should be weighed by a wise Christian of the Spirit (2.14; 12.10; 14.32). In this regard, his pastoral wisdom is to supplement 'weighing what is said for someone's sake' (διακρίνω) to prophecy (4.7; 6.5; 11.29,31; 12.10; 14.29).

³⁰⁷ A. J. Hess, 'διά,' in *EDNT*, vol. 1 (H. Balz and G. Schneider eds.) (Michigan: Eerdmans, 1990), pp. 296-297.

³⁰⁸ Due to their foolish participation in the table of the Lord, many of them have been weak and ill and some have died.

Another crucially important problem was that they cared to be judged at the time when unbelievers and catechumens entered the church, even when one of them had a case against another (6.1; 14.23). Consequently, regarding a religious case between the Corinthian believers, 14.23-25 shows the Corinthians' foolish application of both tongues and prophecy. Also, how should the unbeliever's response to the Corinthian application of prophecy in 14.25 be understood?

7.2.2. An unbeliever's weighing what a believer prophesied as opposed to Christian faithfulness (who should weigh a believer's words and actions?)

Based on reading 14.20-25 from the bottom, A. C. Thiselton assumed that the Corinthian use of prophecy explained in 14.24-25 displayed perfect wisdom.³⁰⁹ However, as the skilled master-builder of God, St. Paul laid the foundation of the church with the wisdom of God (refer to 'ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα' in 3.10). He hoped that the church would be built up on this foundation with the wisdom he explained. As a wise farmer of God, he sowed the seeds of the Spirit in God's field, namely τὰ πνευματικά, which speaks the perfect wisdom of God (Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις) that was hidden, which God marked out beforehand, before the ages, for the saints' glory (2.6-16; 9.11).

However, in St. Paul's absence from Corinth, the church confronted the problem of conflict between strong and weak believers. He taught the strong that they should be foolish in this world order in order to be *wise* (σοφός) (3.18); they did not accept the wisdom and rather discriminated against weak believers, puffing themselves up. St. Paul says that ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος, who wears only the image of the earthy, does not accept 'the things of Spirit of God' (τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ) which were granted freely by God as a favour to believers (2.12-14; 15.47-49). The Corinthians were depicted as God's field at the level of the σαρκίνοις or of children who do not fully understand τὰ πνευματικά St. Paul has sown in (3.1-3; 14.20). In other words,

³⁰⁹ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 1127-1130.

even though the Corinthian church believers received τὰ πνευματικά, their understanding of the gifts was no different from the ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος. Thus, it is likely that the Corinthian practice of using prophecy should have come into question. That is, their prophecy should have been subject to fellow believers, because at least some of prophetesses might have received the educational benefits of γνῶσις (8.7; 13.2) puffed themselves up. Furthermore, they might have awarded more honour to unbelievers with γνῶσις than weak believers without γνῶσις. It is likely that the women prophets surpassed others in speech, skill and γνῶσις and considered themselves as witnesses of who most proficiently proclaimed the word of God (14.36). However, they did not accept St. Paul's ecclesiology based on God's faithfulness and this is the reason that prophetesses were regarded as having the imperfect wisdom of Paul's πνευματικά.

Did strong believers want to enjoy the privilege of being a superior client to weak believers in this world order, rather than support the new family of Pauline Christians, where weak and strong believers are equally honoured within the Christian morality of faithfulness? At last they looked for a wise man who could weigh τὰ πνευματικά they spoke from the outside (6.5). What would St. Paul have thought of the unhelpful Corinthian application of prophecy where all spoke, so a wise unbeliever who did not know the Paul's wisdom, that the strong and the weak are united in Christ, would unfairly weigh what believers prophesied?

Nevertheless, the expression πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον προσκυνήσει τῷ θεῷ of 14.25 is always found as positive in Jewish tradition. Moreover, Thiselton believes that the unbeliever's response to the Corinthian application of judgment with prophecy, that he will fall down on his face and worship God and declare that indeed God is in you, reflects his "shame that the hidden sins of their heart should have been brought to light" petitioning God for forgiveness and performing an act of worship.³¹⁰ In the situation that most of the Corinthians reached the level of children toward Pauline γνῶσις, as well as τὰ πνευματικά (3.1-3; 8.8-13; 14.20), and had no one wise enough

³¹⁰ Thiselton, *The first Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 1130. Also see. BAGD.

to judge for the sake of believers between even two fellow believers (6.5), when the unbeliever with Jewish γνώσις judged believers' prophecy, he would have recognized the best among them and bestowed honour on the strong with γνώσις with approval that 'God is really among you.' The Corinthians could have derived benefit from finding something in common between Jewish γνώσις and Christian γνώσις and in this way, the Corinthian church might have been able to gain official approval by a Jewish wise man (refer to ἀπαγγέλλων in 14.25), as a stepping-stone for the church to establish relations with Corinthian Jewish society on an equal footing.

What made the unbeliever weigh positively what the Corinthian believers prophesied? As explained earlier, some of the strong believers might have known silent speech in Philo. According to *Heres* 266³¹¹, a prophet who is skilful in using philosophical speech in silence and intelligible speech with sweet and harmonious sound is approved to be the truth (ὄντως; also see 1 Cor 14.25). The evidence presented thus far supports the idea that strong believers would have let weak believers be despised through making the unbeliever weigh what the Corinthians prophesied.

However, no matter whether this argument can be proved or not, it is evident here that the wisdom disclosed through judgment by an unbeliever would have been considered as deserving of avoidance (2.13-16). Furthermore, in the situation of divisions and of the Corinthians' childish level of ἀγάπη, weak believers would have been treated as inferior and the conflict would obstruct them in the receipt of honour as a fellow partaker. Accordingly, it would have been better, if the praise

³¹¹ 'After that the historian connects with his preceding account what follows in consistency with it, saying, "And it was said to Abraham"-- for in real truth the prophet, even when he appears to be speaking, is silent, and another being is employing his vocal organs, his mouth and tongue, for the explanation of what things he chooses; and operating on these organs by some invisible and very skilful act, he makes them utter a sweet and harmonious sound, full of every kind of melody.'

that 'indeed God is among you' was able to be given to weak believers by fellow believers for building up the church with ἀγάπη (12.24).

To sum up, in this chapter, the aim was to assess reading 14.24-25 in the extended structure of 14.20-38. The most obvious finding to emerge from this study is that, as explained in the introduction of this chapter, there are a couple of contradictions between 14.24-25, 14.21-22 and 14.26-38. The results of this research support the idea that 14.24-25 should be interpreted as Paul the Apostle's reproof of the Corinthian church's wrong application of prophecy. This study has gone some way towards enhancing our understanding of the Corinthian women prophets as those identified as the very women puffed up with γνῶσις who gave outsiders the seat of judgement to despise the weak (6.1f.; 11.22).

However, this study is limited by the lack of information not only on the wise unbeliever's identity, but on the system of the Corinthian tribunal. An additional weakness in this study is uncertainty about the knowledge the prophetesses had, with which they were able to disclose the hidden things of his heart. Further work needs to be done to establish a relationship between the Corinthian prophetesses and the wise Jewish unbeliever.

Conclusions

Returning to the hypothesis posed at the beginning of this study, it is now possible to state that an alternative way of reading 1 Cor 14.20-25 in regular order seems to offer the most satisfactory solution to the problems raised by the contrast between 14.21-22 and 14.23-25. This study has shown that ch. 14 explains a better way to build up God's building with τὰ πνευματικά and is placed in the fifth part (5. Faithful friendship for God's work [11.2-15.58]) within our whole epistle in which the main subject is described as 'puffedness up and boasting, and ἀγάπη and *faithfulness*'. As explained before, 14.20-25 should be categorized as the first section of the second part of ch. 14 rather than as the last section of first part, so I have argued that not only should 14.22 not be regarded as Paul's logical mistake but 14.23-25 which is contradictory to 14.20-22 and 14.26-38, should be interpreted as Paul the Apostle's reproof about the problem of judgment on believers by outsiders in the situation of divisions which was caused by the strong believers' puffedness up and boasting.

Another finding to emerge from this study is that an interpretive possibility of the tongues depicted in ch. 14 is silent tongue analogous to that in Philo. A third finding was the greater likelihood of Jewish identity over non-Jewish identity for outsiders in 14.21-25. This related to a fourth finding that, along with Isa 28.11, two *Hodayot* can be seen as previous evidence for the law of 1 Cor 14.21. These findings have significant implications for the understanding of how we can variously interpret the term μάλισθ of 14.23. The contribution of this study has been to argue that 14.23-25 should be read as the strong believers' boasting and hostile arrogance against the weak within 14.20-38.

The main weakness of this study was the paucity of evidence in deciding whether the tongues described in ch. 14 was noisy tongue or silent tongue. In addition to that, this study was limited by the absence of research in the nature of prophecy in 14.24-25 and its relation to the Corinthian women prophets. This research has thrown up

many questions in need of further investigation. Further research should be carried out to establish the close relationship between believing prophetesses and outsiders. The findings of this study have a practical implication in relation to the application of the gifts of the Spirit and an issue of judgment. It is necessary that a wise believer who can judge between believers to build up the church so as to protect the weak against being manipulated by the strong, is needed as much in modern churches as it was in ancient Corinth.

Bibliography

I. Primary Literature

Titus Lucretius Carus, *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura IV* (Latin Ed.) Godwin, J. (Comm.) (Warminster: Aris & Philips Ltd, 1991).

Titus Lucretius Carus, *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura V*, Costa, C. D. N. (Comm.) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984).

Martínez, Florentino G. and Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition Vol 1, 2* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

Metzger, B. M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994),

II. Secondary Literature

1. Commentaries

Barclay, J., '1 Corinthians,' in *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (eds. Barton, J. and Muddiman, J.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 1108-1133.

Barrett, C. K., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968).

Collins, R. F., *First Corinthians*, SPS (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1999).

Conzelmann, H., *1 Corinthians*, H-CHCB (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

Aquinas, T., *Commentaire de la Première Épître aux Corinthiens* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002).

Fee, G. D., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Michigan: Eerdmans, 1987).

Fitzmyer, J. A., *First Corinthians*, AB 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).

Garland, D. E., *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2003).

Gromacki, R. G., *Called to Be Saints, An Exposition of 1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, 1977).

Hays, R. B., *First Corinthians*, IBCTP (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1977).

Héring, J., *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (London: The Epworth Press, 1962).

Jewett, R., *Romans*, H-CHCB (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007).

Johnson, A. F., *1 Corinthians*, IVP NTCS (Downers Grove, IL.: IVP, 2004).

Keener, C. S., *1-2 Corinthians*, NCBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

MacArthur, J. F., *1 Corinthians*, MANTC (Chicago, Illinois: Moody Pub., 1984).

Malcolm, M. R., *The World of 1 Corinthians: An Exegetical Source Book of Literary and Visual Backgrounds* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2012).

Moffatt, J., *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, MNTC 7 (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938).

Morris, L., *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, TNTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985).

Olshausen, H., *Biblical Commentary on St Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1851).

Oster, Jr., R. E., *1 Corinthians*, CPNIVC (Missouri: College Press, 1995).

Oswalt, J. N., *The Book of Isaiah chapters 1-39*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986).

Robertson, A. and Plummer, A., *First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, CEC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1911).

Schrage, W., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 3 Teilbd, EKK (Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1999).

Senft, C., *La Première Épître de Saint Paul Aux Corinthiens* (Lausanne: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1979).

Talbert, C. H., *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (New York: Crossroad, 1987).

Thiselton, A. C., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: a Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000).

Weiss, J., *Der erste Korintherbrief*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. 9th edition (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1910).

Witherington III, B., *Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1995).

2. General books

Banner, N., *The Power of the Said: Philosophic Silence in Plotinus* (a PhD dissertation; Exeter: the University of Exeter, 2013).

Beker, J. C., *Paul the Apostle* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980).

Best, E., *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: S.P.C.K., 1955).

Brooke, G., 'Between authority and canon: the Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process,' in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (E.G. Chazon, D. Dimant & R.A. Clements eds.) (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 85-104.

Carson, D. A., 'Mystery and Fulfillment: Toward a More Comprehensive Paradigm of Paul's Understanding of the Old and the New,' in *Justification and ariegated Nomism*, Vol, 2 (D. A. Carson, P. T. O'Brien, and M. A. Seifrid eds.) (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

_____, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1987).

Crook, J. A., *Law and Life of Rome* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1984).

Dautzenberg, G., *Urchristliche Prophetie, ihre Erforschung, ihre Voraussetzungen im Judentum und ihre Struktur im ersten Korintherbrief*. Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, and Mainz: Kohlhammer, 1975.

de Jonge, C. C. and van Ophuijsen, J. M., 'Greek Philosophers on Language,' in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (E. J. Bakker ed) (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).

Dinkler, E., 'Zum Problem der Ethik bei Paulus. Rechtsnahme und Rechtsversicht. 1 Kor 6.1-11,' in *Signum Crucis. Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (Tübingen, 1967).

Dunn, J. D. G., *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998).

Ellis, E. E., *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1978).

Fee, G. D., *God's Empowering Presence* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1994).

Forbes, C., *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and Its Hellenistic Environment* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995).

Gale, H. M., *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1964).

Garnsey, P., 'The Civil Suit,' in *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970).

Gera, D. L., *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language and Civilization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Gillespie, T. W., *The First Theologians: A Study in Early Christian Prophecy* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1994).

Gorman, M. J., *Apostle of the Crucified Lord: A Theological Introduction to Paul and His Letters* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004).

Hall, D. R., *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence* (London: T&T Clark International, 2003).

Harris, W. V., *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989).

Hui, E., *Regulations Concerning Tongues and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians 14.26-40* (London: T&T Clark, 2010).

Horrell, D. G., *An Introduction to the Study of Paul* (London: T&T Clark, 2000).

_____, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996).

Hurd Jr., J. C., *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983).

Jones, A. H. M., *The Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1972).

Kelly, J. M., *Roman Litigation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966).

Kim, D., *신약이 말하는 방언* (용인: 킹덤복스, 2009).

Knibb, M. A., *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

Kunkel, W., *An Introduction to Roman Legal and Constitutional History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2d ed. 1973).

Lang, F., *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, NTD 7 (Göttingen and Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).

Lietzmann, H., *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus: An die Korinther I,II*, Handbuch zum neuen Testament 9 (W. G. Kümmel ed.) (Tübingen: Mohr, 1949).

Long, A. A., 'Stoic linguistics, Plato's *Cratylus*, and Augustine's *De dialectica*,' in *Language and Learning: Philosophy of Language in the Hellenistic Age Proceedings of the Ninth Symposium Hellenisticum* (D. Frede and B. Inwood eds.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Martin, D. B., *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995).

Martin, R. P., *The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12-15* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1984).

Maston, J., *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

Meyer, H. A. W., *Critical and Exegetical handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians* (New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890) (from 5th German ed., 1870).

Meyer, M. W. (ed), *The Ancient Mysteries* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987).

Mitchell, M., *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1992).

Nilsson, M. P., *Greek Piety* (Rose, H. J. trans.) (New York: The Norton Library, 1969).

Pearson, B. A., *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian opponents of Paul and its Relation to Gnosticism* (SBLDS 12; Montana, 1973).

Poirier, J. C., *The Tongues of Angels: The Concept of Angelic Languages in Classical Jewish and Christian Texts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

Robins, R. H., *A Short History of Linguistics* (London: Longman, 1997).

Runia, D. T. (ed), *Philo of Alexandria: An Annotated Bibliography 1997-2006* (Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands, 2012).

Schmithals, W., *Gnosticism in Corinth* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971).

Shum, S. L., *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Roman: A Comparative Study of Paul's letter to the Romans & the Sibylline & Qumran sectarian Texts* (Tübingen: Mohr, 2002).

Tanzer, S. J., *The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the Hodayot* (a PhD dissertation; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, Jan. 1987).

Thiselton, A. C., 'Realized Eschatology at Corinth,' in *Christianity at Corinth* (E. Adams and D. G. Horrell eds.) (London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004).

Van Kooten, G. H., 'The Two Types of Man in Philo of Alexandria and Paul of Tarsus. The Anthropological Trichotomy of Spirit, Soul and Body,' in *Philosophische Anthropologie in der Antike* (L. Jansen, C. Jedan and C. Rapp eds.) (Frankfurt am Main: Ontos, 2010).

Vielhauer, P., *Oikodome: das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom Neuen Testament bis Clemens Alexandrinus* (Heidelberg, 1939).

Wire, A. C., *The Corinthian Women Prophets* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1990).

Yoon, C.-W., *고린도전서 다시 읽기* (서울: 한국성서학연구소, 2011).

Ziegler, K. H., *Das private Schiedsgericht im antiken römischen Recht* (Munich: Beck, 1971).

3. Journals and Dictionaries

Alekniéné, T., 'L'"Extase Mystique" dans la Tradition Platonicienne: Philon D'Alexandrie et Plotin,' in *SPA* 22 (2010), pp. 53-82.

Bailey, K. E., 'The Structure of 1 Corinthians and Paul's Theological Method with Special Reference to 4.17,' *NovT* 25 (1983), pp. 152-181.

Balz, H., 'εἰμί,' in *EDNT*, vol. 1 (Balz, H. and Schneider, G. eds.) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1990), pp. 392-393.

Barclay, J., '1 Corinthians,' in *OBC* (eds. Barton, J. and Muddiman, J.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 1108-1133.

Bartsch, H. W., 'ιδιότης,' *EDNT*, vol. 2 (Balz, H. and Schneider, G. eds.) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 172-173.

Bauer, W., Arndt, W. F., Gingrich, F. W., and Danker, F. W., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. 2d ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979).

Behm, J., 'γλωσσα,' in *TDNT*, vol. 1 (ed. Kittel, G.) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1964), pp. 719-727.

Betz, O., 'σημεῖον,' *EDNT*, vol. 3 (Balz, H. and Schneider, G. eds.) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1993), pp. 238-241.

F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (R.W. Funk trans) (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1961).

Chester, S. J., 'Divine Madness? Speaking in Tongues in 1 Corinthians 14.23,' *JSNT* 27.4 (2005), pp. 417-446.

Clines, D. J. A. (ed), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

Derrett, J. D. M., 'Judgment in 1 Cor 6,' *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 22-36.

Fee, G. D., 'Gifts of the Spirit,' *DPHL* (Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P., and Reid, D. G. eds.) (Leicester, England: IVP, 1993), p. 339-347.

Gesenius, W., *HELOT* (Brown, F. ed) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972).

Gladstone, R. J., 'Sign Language in the Assembly: How are Tongues a Sign to the Unbeliever in 1 Cor 14.20-25?,' *AJPS* 2/2 (1999), pp. 177-193.

Grudem, W., '1 Cor 14.20-25: Prophecy and Tongues as Signs of God's Attitude,' *WThJ* 41 (1979), pp. 381-396.

Hafemann, S. J., 'Corinthians, Letters to the,' in *DPHL* (Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P., and Reid, D. G. eds) (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1993), pp. 164-179.

Harris, G., 'Beginnings of Church Discipline: 1 Cor 5,' *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 1-21.

Hess, A. J., 'διά,' in *EDNT*, vol. 1, (Balz, H. and Schneider, G. eds.) (Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1990), pp. 296-297.

Johanson, B. C., 'Tongues, A Sign for Unbelievers? A Structural and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians XIV.20-25,' *NTS* 25 (1979), pp. 180-203.

Johnson, L.T., 'Tongues, Gift of,' *ABD*, vol. 6 (D. N. Freedman ed) (London: Doubleday, 1992).

Kim, D., '바울의 방언관: 고전 12.30b 과 14.5a 를 중심으로,' *한국신약학회* vol. 13 (2006), pp. 169-191.

Koehler, L. and Baumgartner, W., *HALOT*, vol. 2 (New York: E. J. Brill, 1995).

Lanier, D. E., 'With Stammering Lips and Another Tongue: 1 Cor 14.20-22 and Isa 28:11-12,' *CTR* 5:2 (1991), pp. 259-286.

Merklein, H., 'ἀήρ,' in *EDNT*, vol. 1 (Balz, H. and Schneider, G. eds.) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1990), p. 34.

Meyer, R., 'C. Prophecy and Prophets in the Judaism of the Hellenistic-Roman Period' in 'προφήτης,' *TDNT*, vol. 6 (Friedrich, G. ed) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1968), pp. 812-828.

Michel, O., 'οικοδομέω,' *TDNT*, vol. 5 (Friedrich, G. ed) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1967), pp. 119-159.

Noll, S. F., 'Qumran and Paul,' in *DPHL* (Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P., and Reid, D. G. eds) (Leicester, England: IVP, 1993), pp. 777-783.

O'Brien, P.T., 'Church,' *DPHL* (Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P., and Reid, D. G. eds) (Leicester, England: IVP, 1993), pp. 123-131.

Pawlaczyk, A., 'The Motif of Silence in Philo's of Alexandria Treatise "Quis rerum divinarum heres sit" some remarks, *PJBR* (2000), pp. 127-131.

Peremans, W. 'Égyptiens et étrangers dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque,' *EFH* 8 (1962), pp. 121-155.

Perriman, A. C., 'The Head of a Woman: The Meaning of κεφαλή in 1 Cor. 11.3,' *JTS* 45 (1994), pp. 602-622.

Robek, Jr. M., 'The Gift of Prophesying in Acts and Paul,' in *SBeTh* 5 (1975), pp. 39-54.

Rosner, B. S., 'Paul and Moses Appointing Judges. An Antecedent to 1 Cor 6.1-6?' in *ZNW* 82 (1991), pp. 275-278.

Sandnes, K. O., 'Prophecy: A Sign for Believers (1 Cor 14,20-25),' *Biblica* 77 (1996), pp. 1-15.

Schenk, W., 'κοιτήριον' in *EDNT*, vol. 2 (Balz, H. and Schneider, G. eds.) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1991), p. 321.

Schlier, H., 'ιδιώτης', *TDNT*, vol. 3 (Kittel, G. ed) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1965), pp. 215-217.

Schneider, G., 'ἀγάπη,' *EDNT*, vol. 1 (Balz, H. and Schneider, G. eds.) (Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1990), pp. 8-12.

_____, 'ἀνά,' in *EDNT*, vol. 1 (Balz, H. and Schneider, G. eds.) (Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1990), p. 74.

Schweizer, E., 'πνεῦμα, πνευματικός,' *TDNT*, vol. 6 (Friedrich, G. ed) (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1968), pp. 389-455.

Smit, J. F. M., 'Tongues and Prophecy: Deciphering 1 Cor 14,22,' *Biblica* 75 (1994), pp. 175-190.

_____, 'Two Puzzles: 1 Corinthians 12.31 and 13.3 A Rhetorical Solution,' *NTS*, 39 (1993), pp. 246-264.

Sweet, J. P. M., 'A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia,' *NTS* 13 (1966-1967), pp. 240-257.

Thielman, F., 'The Coherence of Paul's View of the Law: The Evidence of First Corinthians,' *NTS* 38 (1992), pp. 235-253.

Thiselton, A. C., 'The "Interpretation" of Tongues: A New Suggestion in the Light of Greek Usage in Philo and Josephus,' *JThS* (1979), pp. 15-36.

Twelftree, G. H., 'Signs, Wonders, Miracles,' *DPHL* (Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R.P., and Reid, D. G. eds.) (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1993), pp. 875-877.

Westermann, C., 'Geist im Alten Testament,' *ET* 41 (1981), pp. 223-235.

Wright, G., 'Diversity in the Church,' *TE* 14 (1983), pp. 64-68.

Wu, J. L., 'Liturgical Elements,' in *DPHL* (Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P., and Reid, D. G. eds) (Leicester, England: IVP, 1993), pp. 557-560.