

**Translating *Ioudaios* Concepts in Multifaceted Contexts:
An Intertextual Approach to the Rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15**

by

Kennedy Kwame Owiredu



*Dissertation presented in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in the Faculty of Theology at Stellenbosch University*

Supervisor: Prof. Jeremy Punt

April 2022

DECLARATION

By submitting this dissertation electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

April 2022

Copyright © 2022 Stellenbosch University

All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

Bible reading and translation have always been important aspects of the Christian faith. Since as early as the first century CE the writers of the New Testament as well as their respective communities of Jesus-followers have all interacted with the Scriptures of the time directly and indirectly. Paul was one such active participant in this process. Unfortunately, for the majority of the New Testament writers, for some decades now their use of the Scriptures of Israel has been clouded by ideologies of anachronistic Christian categories, historical-critical methodologies have presented generalising descriptions and prescriptions about their identities and methods, and Western ideologies have fed into colonialist and imperialist agendas against Two-Thirds World readers, such as Africans.

In this study, I use and recommend a literary-rhetorical approach known as intertextuality as a methodology to attempt reading and uncovering the rhetoric of one such New Testament writer, Paul, to his implied audiences in a selected text, 1 Corinthians 15. As a literary method intertextuality has been in practice for decades already. More recently some biblical scholars have also identified its usefulness in overcoming the limitations of historical-critical methodologies when Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel is studied. In the field of Scripture translation intertextuality has recently also become a useful tool for the literary analysis of texts. Importantly, several scholars continue to make a case for literary critical methods as a necessary tool for empowering African Christian readers and translators of the Scriptures towards a recovery of authentic Christian identity-(ies).

This study has demonstrated that Paul's *Ioudaios* ethnoculturally-nested identity remains central and relevant to an understanding of his person and his use of the Scriptures of Israel. It has demonstrated specifically that, not only does Paul engage with the Scriptures, but also, that he uses *Ioudaios* conceptualisations, expressions and idioms to communicate the central

themes of his message, with 1 Corinthians 15 serving as a case in point. Even though he communicates to his audience in the Hellenistic *lingua franca* of his time, contemporary readers and translators should endeavour to engage these *Ioudaios* concepts linguistically and intertextually. To this end, Paul was able to sustain his objective in negotiating, affirming and redefining the identity-(ies) of his multifaceted Gentile implied audience. Bible reading and translation in Africa and by Christians in Africa is in dire need of this and can glean many lessons and applications from the Pauline paradigm.

OPSOMMING

Die lees en vertaal van die Bybel was nog altyd belangrike aspekte van die Christelike geloof. Sedert so vroeg as die eerste eeu AD het die skrywers van die Nuwe Testament sowel as hul onderskeie gemeenskappe van Jesus-volgelingen almal direk en indirek met die Geskrifte van daardie tyd in wisselwerking verkeer. Paulus was 'n aktiewe deelnemer in hierdie prosesse. Ongelukkig, vir die meerderheid van die Nuwe-Testamentiese skrywers, is hulle gebruik van die Geskrifte van Israel reeds vir 'n paar dekades vertroebel deur ideologieë van anachronistiese Christelike kategorieë, histories-kritiese metodologieë het veralgemenende beskrywings en voorskrifte oor hul identiteite en metodes aangebied, en Westerse ideologieë het kolonialistiese en imperialistiese agendas teen Twee-derde Wêreld-lesers, soos Afrikane, aangevuur.

In hierdie studie gebruik en beveel ek 'n literêr-retoriese benadering bekend as intertekstualiteit aan as 'n metodologie om die retoriek van een so 'n Nuwe-Testamentiese skrywer, Paulus, aan sy geïmpliseerde gehore in 'n geselekteerde teks, 1 Korintiërs 15, te probeer lees en ontgin. Die literêre metode van intertekstualiteit word al vir dekades lank gebruik. Meer onlangs het sommige Bybelwetenskaplikes ook die nut daarvan geïdentifiseer om die beperkings van histories-kritiese metodologieë te oorkom wanneer Paulus se gebruik van die Skrif van Israel bestudeer word. Op die gebied van Skrifvertaling ook het intertekstualiteit onlangs 'n nuttige hulpmiddel vir die literêre ontleding van tekste geword. Dit is belangrik dat verskeie geleerdes steeds 'n pleidooi maak vir literêr-kritiese metodes as 'n noodsaaklike hulpmiddel om Afrika-Christenlesers en vertalers van die Skrif te bemagtig tot die herstel van outentieke Christelike identiteit(e).

Hierdie studie het getoon dat Paulus se *Ioudaios* etnokultureel-geneste identiteit sentraal en relevant bly vir die verstaan van hom as persoon en sy gebruik van die Geskrifte van Israel.

Dit het heel spesifiek gedemonstreer, met 1 Korintiërs 15 as voorbeeld, dat Paulus nie net by die Geskrifte betrokke was nie, maar ook dat hy *Ioudaios*-konseptualiserings, uitdrukkings en idioome gebruik het om die sentrale temas van sy boodskap te kommunikeer. Al kommunikeer hy met sy gehoor in die Hellenistiese *lingua franca* van sy tyd, moet hedendaagse lesers en vertalers poog om hierdie *Ioudaios*-konsepte linguïsties en intertekstueel te benader. In hierdie verband, was Paulus in staat om sy doelwit te handhaaf in die onderhandeling, bevestiging en herdefiniëring van die identiteit(e) van sy veelsydige nie-Joodse geïmpliseerde gehoor. Bybellees en -vertaling in Afrika en deur Christene in Afrika het dit dringend nodig en kan baie lesse en toepassings uit die Pauliniese paradigma bekom.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to God for the grace, opportunity and strength to complete this research.

I am thankful to Prof. Jeremy Punt, my distinguished Supervisor under whose guidance this work has become a reality. It is indeed an honour to work with you, Sir. My academic journey has been blessed with “fathers” in academia who have shaped my thought and have influenced my interest in my field of study: Most Rev. Prof. J.D.K. Ekem, Rev. Prof. B.Y. Quarshie, Rev. Prof. D.N.A Kpobi, Rev. Prof. Philip T. Laryea, Rev. Dr. G.N.N. Odonkor and Rev. Dr. Seth Kissi. Others include Dr. Roy E. Ciampa, Dr. Samy Tioyé, Prof. Jean-Claude Loba-Mkole. I am thankful to you all.

I thank God for the United Bible Societies, the Bible Society of Ghana and the German Bible Society through whom I received all the necessary resources to make my studies successful. I am thankful to the former General Secretary of the BSG, Rev Dr. Erasmus Odonkor and the current General Secretary, Rev. Dr. Enoch Aryee-Atta, the Council, Management, Staff and colleagues who have in diverse ways supported me on this journey. Also, to the Presbyterian Church of Ghana, the General Assembly Council, I say thank you.

I thank God for my mother, Mrs. Betty Asomaning who has encouraged me since I was born to believe in my potential and reach high. To my spouse, Rita Owiredu, I am thankful for the years of sacrifice and separation we have had to endure to make this dream a reality. This work is equally your “sweat and blood.” To my siblings, Ernestina Nkansah and Dennis Okyere, cheers to the future of our great family. To Mama Rose Teteki Abbey and family, I say thank you.

Finally, I am thankful to Stellenbosch University, the Faculty of Theology, OT and NT Department for the opportunity to embark on this academic journey. Thank you for the academic discipline and collegiality you have imparted to me. I am thankful to Felicity Grové

who edited this work diligently. I am grateful to Theresa Jooste and the entire Theology Library staff. I must also mention special friends and colleagues such as Tulimo Uushona and the entire Bible Study Family led by Papa Ulli and Mama Heidi whose inspiration and friendship carried me through difficult moments of my studies.

To God be the Glory!

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to the memory of my late grandfather, Seth Akyene Mintah, a Christian leader, a mentor and Mathematician. You shaped my life both near and afar, academically and spiritually. During my seminary days which was years after your passing, I was intrigued to find a book on “A Biography of Paul,” the only Christian academic literature among your numerous collections of books on Mathematics. It was then I realized, my interest in Paul and his writings was not a mere coincidence.

May this academic height bring you joy even as you continue to rest in peace, *Nana Banyin*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	2
ABSTRACT	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	7
DEDICATION	9
TABLE OF CONTENTS	10
LIST OF TABLES	15
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	16
CHAPTER 1	17
1.0 Introduction: Subject of Research	17
1.1 Research Problem and Delimitation	19
1.2 Nature of Research and Research Hypothesis	24
1.3 Theoretical Framework	25
1.4 Aim	25
1.5 Motivation	26
1.6 Preliminary Studies Undertaken	27
1.7 Research Methodology	32
1.8 Academic Significance of Research and Value of Research for Field of Study	34
1.9 Outline of Chapters	35
CHAPTER 2	36

2.0 Paul	36
2.1 Introduction	36
2.2 Paul, A Man of Many Worlds or A Man of Any World	36
2.3 Paul, the Hellenistic <i>Ioudaios</i>	42
2.3.1 On Identity(-ies) and Terms: A brief Debate	42
2.3.2 On Identity(-ies): Paul, the Hellenistic <i>Ioudaios</i>	45
2.4 Paul’s Ethnocultural Identity: Second Temple <i>Ioudaismos</i> versus Notions of Early Christianity	53
2.5 Approaching Paul’s Identity: A Paradigm for Translation Activity	58
2.6 Reading/Understanding Paul’s <i>Ioudaios</i> Identity for an African Christian Audience: Hermeneutics of Identity and Bible Translation in Africa	59
2.7 Conclusion	64
CHAPTER 3	65
3.0 Paul’s Roman Corinth: A Study in Historical-Critical and Literary-Rhetorical Analysis	65
3.1 Introduction	65
3.2 Paul’s Roman Corinth: Historical-Critical and Archaeological Discussion	66
3.3 Cult-life, Culture and Social Ethos of Paul’s Roman Corinth	68
3.4 Paul’s 1 Corinthians Correspondence: A Literary-Rhetorical Analysis of the Situation, Context and Identity of his Audience	70
3.5 Audiences in Antiquity and Paul’s Corinthian Audience: Christopher D. Stanley versus Brian J. Abasciano	76

3.6 Channeling or Translating Israel – Communicating to Corinthians: Paul’s Literary-Rhetorical Identity	81
3.7 Translation and Contemporary African Communities as Implied Audience and Readers: Context, Ethnicity and Identity Formation.....	93
3.8 Conclusion	95
CHAPTER 4.....	97
4.0 1 Corinthians 15: Paul’s Use and Reading of the Scriptures of Israel and <i>Ioudaios</i> Concepts.....	97
4.1 Introduction.....	97
4.2 Paul and Ancient First Century CE <i>Ioudaios</i> Techniques of Scripture Citation, Exegesis and Interpretation	98
4.3 Paul’s Use of the Scriptures of Israel: A Literary-Rhetorical Methodology vis-à-vis Intertextuality	108
4.4 1 Corinthians 15: Intertextuality and Hermeneutics – Direct Quotations/ Citations, Allusions and Echoes from the Scriptures of Israel	114
4.5 (Bible) Translation (Studies) and Intertextuality: An African Case Study.....	118
4.6 Conclusion	122
CHAPTER 5.....	124
5.0 An Intertextual Approach to the Rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15.....	124
5.1 Introduction.....	124
5.2 1 Corinthians 15 – What is at Stake?	124
5.3 Intertextual Analysis of the Rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15	127

5.3.1 Verses 1-5:	127
5.3.1.1 Intertextual Analysis	128
5.3.2 Verses 6-11:	133
5.3.2.1 Intertextual Analysis	134
5.3.3 Verses 12-19:	136
5.3.3.1 Intertextual Analysis	137
5.3.4 Verses 20-22:	137
5.3.4.1 Intertextual Analysis	138
5.3.5 Verses 23-24:	139
5.3.5.1 Intertextual Analysis	140
5.3.6 Verses 25-26:	141
5.3.6.1 Intertextual Analysis	141
5.3.7 Verse 27:	143
5.3.7.1 Intertextual Analysis	144
5.3.8 Verse 28:	145
5.3.8.1 Intertextual Analysis	145
5.3.9 Verses 29-34:	147
5.3.9.1 Intertextual Analysis	147
5.3.10 Verses 35-41:	150
5.3.10.1 Intertextual Analysis	151
5.3.11 Verses 42-44:	153

5.3.11.1 Intertextual Analysis	153
5.3.12 Verses 45-50:	155
5.3.12.1 Intertextual Analysis	155
5.3.13 Verses 51-58:	158
5.3.13.1 Intertextual Analysis	158
5.4 Conclusion	162
CHAPTER 6	164
6.0 1 Corinthians 15 – Translation, Postcolonial Issues and <i>Ioudaios</i> Concepts	164
6.1 Introduction	164
6.2 Chapter 5 in Review: Gleanings and Contribution to Academic Knowledge	164
6.3 1 Corinthians 15: An Intertextual Reading of the Bible and its Translation Intertextually for Africa	170
6.3.1 Africans Reading the Bible Intertextually: 1 Corinthians 15	171
6.3.2 Africans Translating the Scriptures Intertextually: 1 Corinthians 15	178
6.4 Conclusion	183
BIBLIOGRAPHY	185

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.4.1	–	E.E. Ellis (1957)	114-115
Table 4.4.2	–	Silva (1993)	115
Table 5.3.1.1	–	Allusion/Echo 1 Corinthians 15:3b-4a.....	128-129
Table 5.3.6.1	–	Allusion 1 Corinthians 15:25	139
Table 5.3.12.1	–	Citation 1 Corinthians 15:45	153
Table 5.3.13.1	–	Citation 1 Corinthians 15:54b-55	158

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASWDC	Asante-Twi with Deuterocanonical
BCE	Before Common Era
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
CE	Common Era
Cor.	Corinthians
CSB	Christian Standard Bible
ESV	English Standard Version
KJV	King James Version
LXT	Alfred Rahlfs' <i>Septuagint</i>
LXX	<i>Septuagint</i>
MT	Masoretic Text
NA ²⁸	Nestle-Aland, <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 28 th Revised Edition
NAS	New American Standard Bible
NBS	La Nouvelle Bible Segond
NET	New English Translation
NIV	New International Version
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
TNIV	Today's New International Version

CHAPTER 1

1.0 Introduction: Subject of Research

The Christian faith, without doubt, traces its roots from a *Ioudaios* background.¹ The foremost bearers and representatives of the Gospel message were all from a predominantly Judean background as the proclamation about the resurrection of Jesus began to spread out further to communities and nations. It is, therefore, undeniable that the Christian faith, even after two millennia, still bears characteristics and features of its parent substratum. A crucial place to begin this observation is evidently in the New Testament Scriptures and its writers. The writers of the New Testament fully brought to bear their *Ioudaios* backgrounds and worldviews on the documents they produced, even when they wrote to people of differing social and cultural backgrounds. A crucial aspect of these *Ioudaios* backgrounds, but not limited to it, is the Scriptures of Israel and the authority attributed to them. The manner in which these writers engaged with the Scriptures of Israel as they interpreted and re-interpreted them in the light of their renewed Messianic experience is indispensable to our understanding of the heartbeat of their perspective and communication of that Gospel message. And this is true and relevant in the case of Bible translation as well.

In his inaugural lecture as full Professor in New Testament Studies, J.D.K. Ekem² (2015) made the following assertion in his published work, *Interpretation of 'Scripture' In Some New Testament Documents: Lessons for the Ghanaian Context*:

¹ In Chapter 2, where I discuss Paul, his identity and ethnocultural background, I provide an explanation for my use of the transliteration *Ioudaios* and the term Judean.

² The Very Rev. Prof. John David Kwamena Ekem is a New Testament Professor who lectures at the Trinity Theological Seminary where he also served as the Academic Dean, the Director of the Centre for Mother Tongue Biblical Hermeneutics. He is a Senior Minister of the Methodist Church Ghana. He is also the Translation Consultant with the Bible Society of Ghana and has served within the United Bible Societies fraternity for over a decade. This background equips him with the experience and the expertise for the issues raised in this proposed study.

I wish to build on the thesis that biblical texts have, since ancient times, been interpreted and re-interpreted in a variety of contexts. Interpreters have also interacted with different versions of particular texts and been directly or indirectly influenced by them. These texts have been consistently undergoing a hermeneutical transformation, in response to changing circumstances. Nonetheless, this should not be misconstrued as a deviation from the core message of Scripture, but rather as an attempt to repackage the latter in such a way as to make it relevant to receptor audiences. This point can be illustrated by means of the techniques employed by some New Testament writers to interpret a variety of texts to their first century CE audiences (2015: 20).

The above thesis is an enlightening statement that holds the key to exploring deeper into the literary contexts of the writers of the New Testament and discovering their perspectives, techniques, and hermeneutical depth. And, as much as it will enable us to uncover, at least to some extent, the biases which contributed to how (and even what) the New Testament writers formulated and wrote in their documents, it will enhance our hermeneutical exercise more profoundly and aid in the arduous task of Scripture translation. Among the writers of the New Testament, one who fits the above assertion in almost all its dimensions is Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles. Ekem rightly builds up on the above thesis with the following:

The early Christian theologians, of whom Paul is a classic representative, drew on the Jewish scriptures to articulate their understanding of God's redemptive intervention in human history through the atoning work of Jesus the Christ. Their theologies were, so to speak, brewed in Judeo-Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman pots (2015: 34; see also Duling, 2003: 188).

Therefore, building on Ekem's foundational thesis and using Paul as a case study, it becomes clear that one can appreciate Paul and his writings only when one has engaged him at the level of his skills, motif, art and objective in repackaging his *Ioudaios* background in the light of the revelation of Jesus as the Messiah. Consequently, it will be worth exploring how he interpreted and re-interpreted the Scriptures in various unique contexts, so as to make them relevant to his receptor audiences. This study explores the literary-rhetorical techniques he employed, focusing on a particular text given the constraints of a study such as this one. Looking beyond Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel and examining how he repackaged

certain cultural and conceptual worldviews are crucial not only to understanding and interpreting his writings but also for the field of Bible translation. Throughout the study, typically from Chapters 2 to 4, my general aim will be one of engaging and critically interacting directly with major and relevant voices that have interacted on this subject and the literary methodology I use, allowing my readers to hear them in their own views and positions. As a relatively new and budding methodology and field of study, both literary methodologies and Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel have garnered wide and sometimes, opposing voices and even scholars revert to their own surmised positions as their knowledge of the fields continues to expand. Notwithstanding this, I affirm and substantiate my own voice as I participate in these discussions.

The particular context of Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians 15 will serve as a case study. In this introduction to this research, the background and preliminary studies will be considered. Also, the research problem, nature of research and research hypothesis, the aim of research, motivation for considering this research, and the research procedure and methodology will be discussed below. This study has great value for the fields of biblical studies, biblical hermeneutics and Bible translation.

1.1 Research Problem and Delimitation

In this study, Paul's 1 Corinthians letter becomes a readily available text for this exercise mainly because a majority of Churches, in Africa, draw their constitution and church praxis from the practical solutions Paul lays out for the community of Jesus-followers in Corinth. The letter addresses matters of theological and ethical nature among believers which are still relevant today for the praxis of believers, such as propriety during worship, and matters relating to the Lord's Supper, leadership and spiritual matters. This study will focus

specifically on Chapter 15 of 1 Corinthians. As will be demonstrated, the subject of the resurrection in Chapter 15, is important for such a study firstly because of the African context which demonstrates several activities and beliefs towards ancestors and the departed. In many African homes, the dead are still part of the living and issues concerning the after-life are a living reality not to be trifled with. Secondly, it is evident that for Paul the subject of the resurrection is the central message of the Gospel. This theme will be examined in Chapters 5 and 6 of this study. Therefore, an intertextual analysis of 1 Corinthians 15 earmarks a relevant focus and subject for the Christian faith in Africa. Thirdly, in the specific case of 1 Corinthians, Paul's discourse and rhetoric prove that this chapter, even though found at the end of the letter, permeates the entire letter with echoes of it already in 1 Corinthians 1 and 2 as Paul talks about the cross. The issues of abuse, over-indulgence and rifts in the community of the believers, for Paul, seemed to be traced to their lack of a divine perspective on this subject of the resurrection. Finally, 1 Corinthians 15 was selected as the focus for this study because Paul refers quite frequently to the Scriptures of Israel and *Ioudaios* concepts, which he interprets and re-interprets uniquely to communicate to his audience.

Paul has stood out as one of the most, if not the most, easily misunderstood writer of the New Testament. And contemporary research in Pauline studies keeps unravelling myriads of concerns and factors that have been overlooked during centuries of studying his personality and writings. These clearly indicate the depth of understanding that still remains to be discovered concerning Paul as a New Testament writer. This is partly due, among many other factors, to his multifaceted ethnocultural background which makes him a highly complex and sophisticated writer.³ This opens up the first of the problems at the heart of this research; a hermeneutical challenge to understanding Paul especially for the purposes of an African

³ In 2 Peter, the writer admits to this problem: "And regard the patience of our Lord as salvation, just as also our dear brother Paul wrote to you, according to the wisdom given to him, speaking of these things in all his letters. Some things in these letters are hard to understand, things the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction, as they also do to the rest of the scriptures" (2 Peter 3:15-16 NET).

context. This challenge is complicated by the Pauline letters already reflecting a strong *Ioudaios* influence within a world probably dominated by Hellenistic and Roman influences.

Therefore, the hermeneutical challenge, also at the heart of Ekem's thesis, is the investigative engine of this research. Firstly, if it can be shown or illustrated that indeed Paul drew on his *Ioudaios* background consistently in all its elements and did indeed repackage worldviews and concepts from this backdrop, then, a case remains to be made for how these concepts and worldviews can be translated and interpreted within an African context. In 1 Corinthians 15, as is customary of him in almost all his writings, there are occasions where Paul quotes the Greek version (LXX) of the Scriptures of Israel and proceeds to engage the text hermeneutically with his context and situation in mind. It is important to investigate the ancient *Ioudaios* and unique techniques Paul uses and specific concepts or ideas in play for communicating these texts effectively. Was he influenced by the Greek versions of those particular texts or did he use them merely as communication tools while interpreting from a *Ioudaios* motif? What was the impact of using a Greek translation of the Scripture, yet filtering these notions through Paul's *Ioudaios* consciousness and understanding?

Subsequently, for an African Christian theological context, examining the place of the Old Testament in the New Testament (which has always been important to the Christian faith), is crucial for the shaping of Christian identity on the continent. Studies have proved that there are convincing analogies between the world of the African and that of the Old Testament (see Mbiti, 1968: 1–6). Mbiti affirms that when Africans engage with the world of the Bible, “they do not have very far to go before they realize that they are walking on familiar ground” (1968: 4). Hence, examining and identifying the role and importance of the Scriptures of Israel in Paul's theology is essential not merely for enabling African Christians to engage appropriately with the Old Testament within the literary context of the New Testament, but

more so, equipping, empowering and stirring the importance of the presence of the primal imagination of the African Christian (see Chapter 2).

With Paul as an important example, how and with what techniques can Africans successfully engage their pre-Christian past as they reflect deeply on their encounter with Christ? Today, the debate whether Paul was a traitor (Wenham, 1995; see Gager, 2015) to his own *Ioudaios* identity has lost its relevance with the numerous examples indicating that Paul rather considered his Messianic experience as some form of a reconfiguration of his *Ioudaios* ethnocultural aspirations and not that it supplanted it. In other words, it is not any more accurate to contend that Paul gave up his *Ioudaios* identity and aspirations as a result of his encounter with the risen Christ or even joining a new “religion” (see Chapter 2). Inherently, this research asserts that Paul remained *Ioudaios* in spite of obvious Hellenistic and Roman influences (see Chapters 2 and 3). Christians within the African religious and cultural context, whilst plagued with Western-brewed theologies, concepts and thought-categories in their Christian praxis, have still yet to come to this similar expression and practical living of the importance of the primal in their Christian experience. Interaction with translation teams further indicates the difficulty when some translators endeavour to adapt words and concepts or forms of interpretation from their own pre-Christian cultural contexts. Through this research, it can be demonstrated that Paul’s *Ioudaios* ethnocultural background was crucial to his rhetoric and mission and this can become the impetus for Christian missions in Africa.

Consequently, exploring and unravelling the techniques, creativity and art that Paul may have engaged to repackage *Ioudaios* worldviews, concepts and texts, in the light of his experience of the revelation of Jesus as the Messiah, may hold the key to doing the most contextually appropriate translation of Pauline texts.

The daunting task of Scripture translation becomes more obvious when working in the Pauline corpus. One often comes across words, concepts and literary styles of Pauline

presentations that are nearly impossible to translate or unpack into target languages or cultures. Part of the struggle is that many translators are caught up in a rigid, non-creative and formal approach. Such virtual interfacing of English and other Western popularized and well-marketed versions exacerbates this struggle as some translators enter into the field with a set predisposition towards these so-called major versions of the translated Bible. One will realize that, going beyond these clear obstacles, this research is seeking to recommend the importance of going beyond even the semantic domain of the Greek text as transmitted to us today but subsequently, also to explore the conceptual *Ioudaios* intertextual backgrounds of these words or concepts. However, contrary to this predisposition on the part of most translation teams, Paul himself, being very creative with his own use of the Scriptures of Israel, re-interprets texts for the varying contexts in which he works without necessarily being hemmed in by the Greek language which was the common language of his day (see Hays, 1989). The principles of interpretation and re-interpretation used by Paul could provide great insight and possibly some exemplary contributions for translators, particularly when they engage Pauline writings. Study Bible projects and commentaries targeting the African context can benefit immensely from such research discoveries.

Therefore, in summary, the research *problem* which this study seeks to address is the challenge of interpreting Paul today, for African audiences characterized by multi-lingual and social and religious diverse contexts, while unravelling his literary technique, compounded as it is by his multifaceted background; key among which was his *Ioudaios* identity as is apparent in his use of the Scriptures of Israel and *Ioudaios* concepts. All the latter aspects were channelled through a Greek linguistic medium, typified by his use of the Greek translations (and Hebrew as well) of his day and achieving the objectives of Bible translation work.

1.2 Nature of Research and Research Hypothesis

Outlining Paul's literary methodology and technique in repackaging his *Ioudaios* worldview in the light of his understanding of Jesus as the Messiah, will allow fresh insights into the field of Bible translation. We could possibly also tap into this methodology toward more creativity in mediating presentation of the biblical texts to their target cultures. This will be so relevant to the African multifaceted context, and embrace the permeating presence of the primal worldview (see Chapter 2). As much as Paul held the Scriptures of Israel in high esteem and was positively predisposed to his *Ioudaios* worldviews and concepts, he was as a consequence and not in spite of that, willing to command all that was at his disposal to communicate the Gospel message in all its various dimensions to his multifaceted audience. Paul may have spoken and written in Greek, and perhaps Latin, but nonetheless, he continued to interpret and communicate his Gospel primarily from the substratum of his *Ioudaios* background. In such manner, he was able to set himself as an example, both figuratively and literarily, so that his audience could also begin to engage their own ethnocultural identities with the paradigm of Israel as example (see Chapter 3). It has been established that the Bible of the early Jesus movement was the Greek version(s), that is a translation of the ancient Hebrew text. Further to this, it is obvious from studies that the scribes who produced these texts were creative in their approach which shows up in the writings of a New Testament writer like Paul. Considering all these then, models in the sense of imaginative literary frameworks become possibilities to consider in New Testament hermeneutics and exegesis, and additionally, for the field of Bible translation studies today.

Therefore, the *hypothesis* of this dissertation is that Paul's *Ioudaios* ethnocultural background, in all its complexity and subtlety, was an active and major element in his rhetoric vis-à-vis his use of the Scriptures of Israel and concepts, and that a careful investigation of these literary features will not only throw light on how to engage with his

texts hermeneutically and contextually, but equally important is that such an investigation may yield landmark results for the task of Bible translation.

1.3 Theoretical Framework

This research study will engage the broad field of biblical studies and hermeneutics. I will study texts in their Greek and Hebrew renderings (see Chapter 5). As stated, it will involve the science and art of biblical hermeneutics from a literary-rhetorical perspective. As will be observed below, the field of translation studies is an interdisciplinary field. Three major aspects are the fields of linguistics, anthropology and biblical studies as well as theology. All these will be useful for the purposes of this study, by providing the intellectual framework for the research and findings.

1.4 Aim

This research aims to re-ignite discussions on the manner in which New Testament writers, Paul as a specific case, engaged with their *Ioudaios* ethnocultural backgrounds vis-à-vis their sacred texts, cultural and social worldviews and concepts in the light of their encounter with Jesus as the Messiah. The usefulness of this discussion to the field of Bible translation will be the point of focus. This will be illustrated through the specific context of the community of believers in Corinth, insofar as that can be determined through the study of Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians 15, Chapter 15. The study aims to make a contribution to on-going discussion on the interpretation of Paul's writings and contends strongly that ultimate attention must be paid to this all-important aspect of Paul as a New Testament writer, his *Ioudaios* background and how he made active use of the literary elements of this background, in all its complexity, in his writings as this will be crucial for responsible translation.

Similarly, this is crucial for Scripture engagement and interpretation in Africa. I aim to demonstrate this as well.

In translation studies, by illustrating that Paul himself was creative in engaging with the Scriptures of Israel, his *Ioudaios* conceptual worldviews and thought-categories, this study aims to give translation teams the opportunity to be creative and yet faithful to the dynamics of the texts. Ekem (2015) has illustrated this using a case study from Romans. In this respect, this study aims to raise queries on the translation of certain key words and concepts in Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians 15 and like Ekem (2015), will make proposals in the final chapter on creative and meaningful renderings which can speak more to the situations of African Christians, drawing on concepts and terms from their primal context.

1.5 Motivation

This research is committed primarily to New Testament studies and subsequently, to the broader field of biblical studies and their hermeneutical nuances. Furthermore, as a Translation Officer with the Bible Society of Ghana, the field of translation studies is an important aspect of my research interest. My work with translation teams on various mother-tongue language projects keeps me constantly reflecting on how best the Judeo-Christian Scriptures can be made to latch onto the convictions and concerns of the receptor or stakeholder cultures of these particular translation projects. I am motivated to reflect on the context and desire that the translated text will be relevant and speak to the target cultures, without divorcing them from their origins or roots. This motivation exemplifies the same kind of dynamic balance Paul maintained in his mission to the Gentiles. And this has driven my interest to go further in understanding the literary-rhetorical context of the writings of the New Testament, specifically 1 Corinthians 15 as case study in this dissertation, so that I can

draw the correlation between their conceptual world and the world of the recipients of the translated texts today. It has been proven beyond contestation that there are clear analogies between the thought-categories of the ancient biblical world and those emerging from African contexts.

1.6 Preliminary Studies Undertaken

In the opening lines of his article, *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel: How much Hermeneutical Awareness did He Display?* Jeremy Punt (2000) gives a hint of the nature of the study of Paul's Scripture use. He writes that

There is little disagreement that Paul frequently quoted from or alluded to other documents or traditions in the letters he composed, referring to both the communications directed at him... as well to contemporary traditions known to him. The latter prominently includes his use of the Scriptures of Israel. Paul's use of these traditions has bred some interesting discussions, led to some fierce debate and intense controversy, but, more importantly, has illustrated its usefulness for a better understanding of the Pauline documents (2000: 311).

Clearly, Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel as a field of study is crucial to Pauline studies and hence, not a few scholars have engaged with discussions on it. Moisés Silva (1993) also observes that

Paul's use of Scripture has profound theological implications, and these have caused heated debate throughout the history of Christianity, such as the church's conflicts with Marcion in the second century, the sixteenth-century debates among Protestants regarding the continuing validity of the OT Law, the more recent disagreements between covenant theologians and dispensationalism, and so on (1993: 630).

In the above article, Silva provides a panoramic survey of the discussions that have taken place on this subject. He states his objective as follows: "this article seeks to provide a survey of the textual data and to shed light on Paul's principles of biblical interpretation" (Silva, 1993: 630). The criteria he uses to achieve this objective are discussing the issue along the following four lines: explicit citations, allusions, Paul and Jewish exegesis and biblical

interpretation in Paul's writings. Concerning the first criterion, Silva concedes that "this approach, though, understandable, can prove misleading" (Silva, 1993: 639). He further explains that

it is possible that a particular quotation, though explicit and verbatim, may play only an illustrative role and thus will not tell us very much about Paul's fundamental conceptions. Conversely, some of the apostle's arguments that do not contain any apparent citations reflect a very deep insight into, and dependence upon, OT themes (Silva, 1993: 630).

Nonetheless, he does not discount the use of such an approach, at least not as a starting point. He provides a list of Old Testament citations found in all Pauline-related writings in the New Testament. Both the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text are referenced among these citations. In the statement above, Silva's (1993) latter observation is what makes it necessary for such studies on Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel to look further to the microscopic level of words and concepts which he engages with in his rhetoric. This study, however, takes these into consideration and focuses on the particular case of 1 Corinthians 15. Silva also affirms that "many passages that contain verbatim citations can reflect important interpretive principles" (1993: 634). Therefore, in the specific case of 1 Corinthians 15 this list will be reviewed, at some point in this work. There will also be an attempt to map out Paul's hermeneutical technique of repackaging his *Ioudaios* thought-categories in the light of his experience of the revelation of Jesus as the Christ to a multifaceted audience, the community of believers in Corinth. Concerning the second criterion, Silva iterates that "the category of 'allusion' itself can cover a rather broad range of scriptural uses: loose quotations, references to events, intentional appeals to specific passages, verbal similarities used (perhaps unconsciously) to express a different idea, broad undercurrents of themes, even totally unintentional correspondences" (1993: 634). With such an approach, it is possible one would be gleaning every word and sentence Paul has written or which is associated with his writings. Silva acknowledges that there is "hardly a paragraph in the Pauline corpus" (1993:

634) which “fails to reflect the influence of the OT on the apostle’s language and thought, a complete list of these allusions would be very long indeed” (Silva, 1993: 634). As much as this is true, in the case of a specific book or chapter, such a list or research should be possible, just as Silva (1993) himself demonstrates using the Letter to the Philippians as a case study. It is possible, then, to do this in the case of the First Letter to the Corinthians 15. The category of allusions will enable me to explore beyond the limits of just the cited texts of the Scriptures of Israel and examine the broader context of words, concepts, ideas, and idioms that have shaped Paul’s writings and evidently played a crucial role in his rhetoric. This has great implications for the task of Bible translation. As much as it is becoming increasingly important to avoid the extreme straight-jacket approach of literal translation or word-for-word translation, gaining such broad understanding and panoramic view of the literary and cultural domain within which Paul chose his words will surely help equip translation teams more efficiently. Literary approaches have become increasingly relevant to the task of Bible translation. This is a broad and interesting field of discussion on which Ernst Wendland (2004) has written extensively (see also Alter & Kermode, 1987; Jin, 2003). For the third criterion, Silva discusses the relationship that may have existed between “Paul and Jewish Exegesis.” He speculates about the possibility that

as an educated and religious first-century Jew, Paul would of course have been familiar with the range of principles and techniques employed by his contemporaries. We have already seen his indebtedness to the interpretive tradition preserved in the LXX. It is also reasonable to think that Paul would have learned from the targumic tradition, that is, the Aramaic interpretive renderings of the Hebrew Bible that were part of the synagogue liturgy (whether written targumim were available to him is debated) (Silva, 1993: 635).

Silva looks beyond merely the targumic tradition and explores other techniques such as Alexandrian exegesis, Qumran exegesis, Rabbinic exegesis and other sources that include “the so-called apocryphal and pseudepigraphic books” (1993: 639–640). I discuss these issues in Chapter 4.

In his concluding remarks, Silva (1993) refutes the erroneous notion held by some scholars, that Paul is arbitrary with his use of the OT (see Silva, 1993: 639–640). Similar to Silva (1993), this is a position Ekem (2015) holds as observed from the opening quotation above (see Ekem, 2015: 20). Silva (1993) considers that the task rather lies on us, today, to track and clearly map out the ancient techniques and the interpretive traditions that influenced Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel (see Silva, 1993: 639–640). In this research, with 1 Corinthians 15 as a case study, it is proposed that a book-by-book or a letter-by-letter or even chapter-by-chapter discussion and categorization could help the study of Paul's unique reading and interpretive technique of the Scriptures and demonstrate his *Ioudaios* ethnocultural background as well. In other words, instead of conducting a broad survey of the whole cross-section of Pauline writings and attempting to discover a general principle or methodology, a unique study of each Pauline writing that explores and maps out the particular technique of that specific letter or book can also be of great value. On occasion Paul even applies differing styles of presentation or interpretation according to his audiences. Punt (2000) shares this sentiment when he expresses that indeed, more study should be devoted to Paul's use of Scripture in a particular document (see Punt, 2000: 317). Silva (1993) also uses Habakkuk 2:4 as a test case to examine how Paul exegetes and interprets this text in Galatians and Romans. These are his closing remarks:

It is plain, then, that Paul was not careless when he quoted the Scriptures. True, the apostle's use of his Bible did not in every respect conform to methods that modern exegesis considers appropriate, but only a superficial reading of his letters could lead one to regard that use as invalid or irresponsible. Quite the contrary, the very categories with which he presented his understanding of Christ's work clearly arose from a serious study of the OT that was both meticulous and comprehensive. Guided not only by the text's historical meaning, but also by its divine authority, by the need to actualize the biblical message, by the power of literary associations and by a Christological view of redemptive history, Paul succeeded both in setting forth the truth of the gospel and in teaching God's people how Scripture should be read (1993: 641–642).

Hence, in Silva's perspective, Paul's use of the Scriptures was guided extensively by the following five dimensions: the historical meaning of the text, its divine authority, the need to actualize the biblical message, the power of literary associations and finally, by a Christological view of redemptive history. These deductions come close to a panoramic view of Paul's use of the Old Testament. The importance of exploring this subject in the specific situation of individual books is an area not fully engaged. So far, such a focused research in the specific case of 1 Corinthians 15 as this work attempts to do is yet to be seen,⁴ and further to this, the application stage of discussions and findings to the field of Bible Translation Studies is also an untapped area.⁵ Works like those of Williams III (2008) and Ciampa & Rosner (2007) and others will be reviewed in Chapter 4. Scholarship in Africa on hermeneutics and exegesis of Pauline studies is yet to benefit from these current trends on Paul and his *Ioudaios* ethnocultural background vis-à-vis the Scriptures of Israel. Ekem, to a large extent, made this case in his closing remarks:

The LXX is an important transition to the New Testament documents. Given its legendary African origin via Alexandria, African Seminaries, Bible Colleges and University Departments of Theology/Religion should attach more importance to it than has hitherto been the case. I should like to see more African scholars specialize in LXX Studies... Prospective Ghanaian/African biblical scholars should take the study of the Targums very seriously in order to better appreciate the resilient Aramaic foundations of the New Testament documents... it has become clear that Africa has a golden opportunity to make an original contribution to biblical scholarship at the global level (2015: 60–62).

The above remarks by Ekem (2015) also express an important turn in this proposed work, which is the fact that the linguistic and communicative domain of Paul's writings is crucial to

⁴ In the journal series titled "Pauline Studies" edited by Stanley E. Porter, H.H. Drake Williams III (2008) has written an article on the topic: "Light Giving Sources: Examining the Extent of Scriptural Citation and Allusion Influence In 1 Corinthians" (see Williams III, 2008: 7–37). Williams III concedes in his conclusion that his research is inconclusive and thus remarks that he hopes the information he has given "will provide some starting point for considering Paul's identity as expressed in 1 Corinthians" (2008: 37).

⁵ In the *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, Roy Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner (2007) worked on the Book of First Corinthians. Their work will subsequently be reviewed carefully. But currently, it is quite certain that their work as a Commentary did not apply to the field of Bible Translation directly (see Ciampa & Rosner, 2007: 695–752).

this proposed work. Ekem (2015) has pointed out already that with the domination of the koine Greek as the lingua franca in the New Testament world, the resilience of Aramaic as mother-tongue cannot be overlooked (see Ekem, 2015: 60). He has demonstrated in the case of Romans and Matthew that New Testament writers, Paul here, as a case in point, still showed clear signs of the presence of the Aramaic mother-tongue in their writings.

In conclusion, this section on preliminary studies demonstrates the exigent nature of this study. There are unexplored spaces and applications, specifically for the multifaceted African context, such as investigating *Ioudaios* conceptualisations within chapters or pericopes that this study seeks to achieve with translation studies in mind. Bible Translation is an interdisciplinary field combining the broad disciplines of anthropology, theology and linguistics. Hence, in that respect, it will be necessary to explore the linguistic function of Paul's *Ioudaios* background in 1 Corinthians 15.

1.7 Research Methodology

This work will involve a literary-rhetorical discussion of the Greek text of 1 Corinthians 15 and engage the text vis-à-vis identifying citations (both direct and indirect) from the Scriptures of Israel, allusions to and echoes from them whether through the use of key conceptual terms, or idioms, metaphors or figurative speech, and also, examining the author's rendering of certain Greek words and concepts which may have a more *Ioudaios* than Greek undergirding.

The primary literary-rhetorical methodology to be used is intertextuality (see Chapters 4 and 5). In this research, I critique the traditional historical-critical approaches and point out the relevance of literary critical methodologies such as intertextuality, that enable researchers in the field of biblical studies to explore and investigate the text in dimensions that the former

fails to achieve (see Chapters 3 and 4). Among other factors, the limitation of the historical-critical methodologies – to focus on the received text with its literary complexities rather than constantly positing a reading and meaning of the text as lying behind the text – closes down the rich literary elements inherent in the text. Following the works such as those of Schüssler Fiorenza (1987, 1999); Segovia (1995a, b) who have argued for literary criticism, I seek to focus on the literary intertextuality of Paul's rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 15. I discuss these methodologies further in Chapters 3, 4 and 5.

I must emphasize that, by this approach and critiques, I do not downplay the relevance of historical-critical approaches for biblical studies. In the following chapters (2, 3 and 4), I have used both methodologies at a comparative level in showing how both methodologies can indeed be complementary. Nonetheless, the study displays a bias for literary methodologies, in this case intertextuality because as a more recent methodology, it requires further exploration of its potential results and outcomes in the fields of biblical studies and Bible translation. As a literary methodology, intertextuality can be useful in the field of Bible translation as the results in Chapters 5 and 6 demonstrate. Translators should pay attention not only to the historical background of texts but more so, the neighbouring (both near and far) intertexts that the writers of the Scriptures interact with (consciously and unconsciously) in order to discover depths of meaning to bring the text to life.

Consequently, in the field of Bible translation, while focusing on the author's *Ioudaios* literary and socio-cultural backdrop, a literary-rhetorical approach will be used to examine how some Bible versions have translated certain words and concepts in 1 Corinthians 15. For the African context, a case study will be made using some Ghanaian translated texts and mother-tongue languages to demonstrate how understanding and interpreting Paul from his *Ioudaios* backdrop impacts on a literary translation of 1 Corinthians 15.

1.8 Academic Significance of Research and Value of Research for Field of Study

The importance of Pauline studies for biblical studies in general, and New Testament studies in particular cannot be over-emphasized. Christian mission and the church in its past and present generation owe a great debt to Paul and his writings. Dennis L. Stamps writes that

The Pauline letters are central to Christian history and theology. The letters attributed to Paul comprise the largest corpus in comparison with all the other New Testament authors. They are the earliest witness to the life and faith of the first Christians, pre-dating the writing of the canonical Gospels. As such, they present firsthand insight into the expansion of Christianity beyond the borders of Palestine into the wider Mediterranean world. These letters also provide the foundation for many of the central Christian beliefs and statements of faith (2007: 265).

The above is clear indication of the importance of any research work undertaken on the subject of Paul and his writings; and that applies to this research study. The measure of attention that scholars have paid to this subject is indicative of its importance to scholarship and Christian mission. Further to this, studies on Paul's use of Scripture and his *Ioudaios* ethnocultural background have unraveled insights concerning his identity and for that matter, contemporary Christian missions in the African context.

In the specific case of this research, as indicated above, an intertextual analysis of Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel in the rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15, the influence of his *Ioudaios* ethnocultural background vis-à-vis his use of concepts and expressions would contribute to highlighting the importance of a focus on a book-by-book or chapter-by-chapter investigation of Paul's use of Scripture. From an African perspective, an intertextual reading of 1 Corinthians 15 contributes to how relevant Paul's use of Scripture can be to inform Scripture translation work, interpretation and Christian missions to a non-Western Christian context.

1.9 Outline of Chapters

Chapter 1 is the introduction to the current study, stating the objectives, scope, theoretical framework, aim and motivation for this research. In Chapter 1 I have also indicated preliminary readings done on the area of research, the research methodology and finally, the academic significance of this study. In Chapter 2 I discuss Paul's *Ioudaios* ethnocultural identity and make the case that it is important to study Paul still within this context in order to be able to read and understand his letters for us today. In Chapter 3 I explore the socio-cultural setting of the Jesus-followers in Corinth as a Roman colony but still a Hellenistic city. The study reveals how multifaceted their setting remained and how Paul's rhetoric had to negotiate paths of identity formation in order to communicate the Gospel of the risen Lord. Once again, in both Chapters 2 and 3, I continue to make a case for a literary-rhetorical methodology as a key approach to discovering the multifaceted identity negotiations as well as the rhetorical situations of Paul's multifaceted implied audiences. In Chapter 4 I review the works of some scholars who have examined Paul's technique in his use of the Scriptures of Israel. I also critique the work of some scholars who downplay the consciousness of Paul's citations. The chapter sets up the stage for the intertextual analysis of 1 Corinthians 15, which takes place in Chapter 5. Finally, in Chapter 6, I present a review of what has been analyzed and discussed so far, and examine the possibilities of these outcomes for the multifaceted contexts of Africa vis-à-vis readings of Scripture and the work of Scripture translation.

CHAPTER 2

2.0 Paul

2.1 Introduction

Beyond ascertaining the familiar facts about Paul's background and personality, focusing on his Israelite ancestry and heritage, this chapter seeks to explore, specifically, whether his ethnocultural background played a role in his cross-cultural mission. In this light, the objective of this chapter goes beyond a biographical or personality profile; rather, the prevalent question is: in what frame of self-actualization should Paul's self-identity as an Israelite be cast for understanding him as one who mediated and communicated *Ioudaios* concepts to a religiously and socio-culturally diverse world? The relevance of these concerns for Scripture translation and, for that matter, Christian faith in Africa, will be discussed.

2.2 Paul, A Man of Many Worlds or A Man of Any World

This section presents a brief survey of Paul's hybrid personality and does not aim to offer a comprehensive description.⁶ Paul is a man who lived, travelled in and experienced a world of multiple cultures, a world of Romans, *Ioudaios*, Hellenists and many other groups aligned through ethnicity, culture and other socio-cultural factors. More importantly, he was a man born and well-versed in these multiple ethnocultural spheres, of which, commonly known to the field of Biblical studies are the Roman, *Ioudaios* and the Hellenistic. The attempt to determine the influence on his socio-cultural identity of any one of these strands or features is still a complex issue open for discussion. Stanley E. Porter has expressed this: "Paul is both a complex individual of the ancient world, because he combines in his one personage features

⁶ Scholarly works that discuss Paul's hybrid personality include but are not limited to the following: Calvin J. Roetzel (1999), E.P. Sanders (2009), Gerald F. Hawthorne *et al* (1993), James D.G. Dunn (2003) and Stanley E. Porter (2008a).

of life in each of these cultural-ethnic (and even religious) areas of the ancient world, and one of many people of that world who evidenced such complexity” (Porter, 2008a: 1). E.P. Sanders has expressed similar sentiments: “what we do not know at the outset is *how deeply* he was embedded in each culture” (2009: 76, italics in original). Yet these statements do not nullify the relevance of investigating these influences on his identity formation and function, especially in his literary engagements. It remains a significant discussion in the field of biblical studies.

Significantly, his name, whether Saul or Paul, which is used in the New Testament,⁷ points to this socio-cultural effect on his life. Evidence from Acts points out that Paul was born in Tarsus of Cilicia (Acts 22:3).⁸ His parents are not mentioned in any of these accounts but mention is made of a sister and a nephew (mother and son) in Acts 23:16. However, Paul’s appeal to Caesar in Acts 25 suggests that his parents or grandparents obtained Roman citizenship, to which Paul then also became entitled (see Adams, 2008: 309–326). Further, the author of Acts mentions Paul’s Judean education “at the feet”⁹ of one Gamaliel (Acts

⁷ Even though the name Saul is mentioned only by Luke in Acts of the Apostles, there is little doubt that the same person is implied in the rest of the account and the personality identified elsewhere in the New Testament (mostly the Pauline corpus and 2 Peter 3:15) as Paul. In Acts, Luke’s narration shows the same person is implied throughout. The name Saul portrays Jewish roots and its Latin or Roman rendering, *Paulus*, certainly points to the Greco-Roman setting within which he lived and travelled (see Bruce, 1993: 681; Zetterholm, 2009: 16; Lynwood Smith, 2015: 139–140). See also (Murphy-O’Connor, 1996: 41–43) for a more detailed discussion of this subject from the perspective of Paul’s Roman citizenship.

⁸ Scholarly works regarding the historical veracity or, in other words, the weight of historicity behind Luke’s sequel, Acts of the Apostles, is still an ongoing discussion. Further to this discussion, is the problem of what to make of the book’s content or assertions, biography and portrait of Paul, the apostle, especially in relation to the scanty biography in the Pauline corpus. For some contemporary scholars on Acts as an eyewitness account of Paul’s life and ministry, the verdict seems to be a more skeptical view of Acts and its authorial intentions, content and methodology. Darrell L. Bock (2007), for example, has traced the beginnings of this skepticism briefly in his own commentary, alongside indicating some proponents of this approach. In this research, without ignoring the warnings of those on the skeptical divide, I consider the account of Acts from a literary-rhetorical perspective and hence, “whether or not the ‘historical’ Luke knew and traveled with the ‘historical’ Paul, the literary issue of the relationship of the book of Acts to Paul’s letters remains” (Parsons, 2008: 16). This is my utmost concern in this research. Other works related to the discussion on Acts and Paul (his letters as well) include: F.F. Bruce (1993), and Craig S. Keener (2012: 90–257).

⁹ The Greek expression used by Luke, *παρὰ τοὺς πόδας*, in Acts 22:3 literally translated “at the feet” is commonly understood as being formally educated and trained by someone. In Paul’s case, Gamaliel is in reference here.

22:3) which likely took place in Jerusalem.¹⁰ Paul was educated and raised to become a member of the Pharisaic sect. In various instances, Paul shows knowledge of and ostensibly indicates his belief in both the written and the oral Law, the resurrection, the prophets and the writings, and the ceremonial or covenantal privileges of circumcision, Sabbath and dietary laws and washings. His Judean education, which will be discussed further in the next section, played a defining role in his life. So far, it can be also surmised that Paul was literate in Hebrew, Aramaic (Acts 22:2), Greek and with little dispute, Latin.¹¹ Notwithstanding, Paul may have received some formal education during his youth in Tarsus, viz. from the Hellenistic rhetoric and philosophical schools such as Stoicism, Epicureanism and Cynicism. This is possible because of Tarsus being a well-known educational hub in the Mediterranean world. Strabo (*Geography*, 14.5.13) writes, concerning Tarsus: “The people at Tarsus have devoted themselves so eagerly, not only to philosophy, but also to the whole round of education in general, that they have surpassed Athens, Alexandria, or any other place that can be named where there have been schools and lectures of philosophers’ (Strabo *Geography*, 14.5.13). He adds that: “Further, the city of Tarsus has all kinds of schools of rhetoric” (Strabo *Geography*, 14.5.13) and goes on to mention, along with their achievements, some prominent philosophers who taught in Tarsus (see Strabo *Geography*, 14.5.14). The Hellenistic educational system included basic education of reading and writing, followed by the study of mathematics and rhetoric and other related studies (see Porter, 2008b: 101). Furthermore, Strabo (*Geography*, 14.5.13) has indicated that the educated in Tarsus were fond of completing their education abroad and even remaining abroad to further their

¹⁰ Opposite opinions to this view have suggested that Acts 22:3 is a reference to Tarsus and not Jerusalem. Stanley Porter has summarized the discussions and pointed to the fact that “Paul could have been educated in both Tarsus and Jerusalem” (2008b: 100).

¹¹ For a discussion on this see Porter (2008c: 289–308). In this article, after making an obvious case for Paul’s proficiency in Greek, Aramaic and/or Hebrew, Porter (2008) proceeds to discuss three strands, alongside supplementary arguments from Acts of the Apostles, that convince him that Paul spoke Latin as a third or fourth language. The three strands are: a. Paul’s travel itinerary, b. cities visited by Paul and c. Latinisms in Paul’s language. And even though Porter concedes frequently that these are not conclusive evidence, nonetheless “there is some circumstantial evidence that Paul would have known Latin” (2008c: 307).

education and not returning home. This narrative, supported by Porter (2008) as well, seems to fit Paul's educational background quite well in the Book of Acts (22:3) and his primary letters (see Philippians 3:5). In the specific case of Paul, Porter agrees to the view that "as a Roman citizen and the son of a person with a productive trade (which probably resulted in the citizenship of his father or an earlier relative), Paul would apparently have had sufficient status and economic support to finance his attending the grammar school" (2008b: 102). This and much other evidence that Porter (2008) provides, supports the assumption that Paul was acquainted with Hellenistic thought-life, literature and education. He also corroborates this assertion in his writings, pointing out places where the rhetoric prevalent in the Hellenistic world of Paul's time as well as literary works, are present and used competently by Paul.¹² In contemporary scholarly discussions concerning Paul's letters and ancient (especially Greco-Roman) philosophical ideas and schools, more and more analogues (as well as departing lines of thought) have been identified and probed for discussion (Malherbe, 1989; Stowers, 1994; see Engberg-Pedersen, 2002). Quite often, the general conclusion echoed by New Testament scholars is that Paul may have been partly acquainted with such schools (see Yamauchi, 1993: 383–388).¹³ Nonetheless, pushing the frontiers a bit further, other scholars hold a different view to this. Quite recently, Stanley Stowers (2015) has engaged with the work of A.J. Malherbe (1989) along this theme. Stowers explores, legitimately, the necessity of looking beyond merely the Stoics (when it comes to Paul and the Hellenistic Philosophical schools) and rather "give serious consideration to the Platonists as well as the Stoics"

¹² See Porter (2008b: 104–105), he mentions examples of some ancient Hellenistic literary sources that Paul quotes directly or indirectly in his letters and in Acts where Luke refers indirectly to Paul's quotations. In a more recent publication, Porter & Dyer (2016), have explored Paul's life and his letters through the lens of ancient rhetoric.

¹³ After reviewing a number of instances when Paul exhibited knowledge of Hellenistic thought-life (for example: Acts 17:28; 1 Corinthians 15:33; and Titus 1:12) or used literary styles associated with Hellenistic philosophical schools of his time, E.M. Yamauchi concludes that "as these were commonplace sayings, they do not prove that Paul read the literary works or that he attended plays, but they do show that he had enough acquaintance with such works to use them as illustrations in his sermons and in his letters" (Yamauchi, 1993: 386).

(Stowers, 2015: 144).¹⁴ In his view, “if one were to mount the kind of major case for Platonic impact on Paul that Engberg-Pedersen has made for Stoicism, two areas of Platonic thought seem most important for him, moral psychology and assimilation to a god” (2015: 149). In another article, Stowers has made a similar argument, citing Paul’s letter to the Romans: for example on the theme of self-mastery, “Paul’s letters use all of the major terms that philosophers used in their discussions of self-mastery and its opposite” (2003: 534). Hence, he asserts that “reading scripture through the lens of Greek philosophy and combining Stoic and Platonic elements in ethics and on the nature of the person were intellectual currents in the air that Jews like Paul breathed” (Stowers, 2003: 539). Terence Paige’s contribution in the *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*, on the topic “Philosophy,” demonstrates another example of Paul’s active engagement with the philosophical ideas of his generation in his letters and cross-cultural mission (see Paige, 1993). These investigations imply that Paul may not have been, as lightly perceived by some, merely acquainted with these Hellenistic schools and their ancient philosophical ideas or thought-life patterns. Rather, without doubt, “Paul was a participant of his culture” (Stowers, 2003: 540), “deliberately using *Greco-Roman philosophical* themes in redefined ways” (Paige, 1993: 717, emphasis mine) and “in a reoriented framework” (Paige, 1993: 717).

Even though Paul’s Judean education will be discussed below, it will be necessary to indicate here that some scholars have not ruled out the possibility of Paul having being introduced and

¹⁴ Stanley Stowers has remarked that “scholarship going back to the early twentieth century has often argued for some Stoic elements in Paul’s letters, especially in ethics. The situation with Platonism is different. Pauline studies, I believe, has [*sic*] suffered from an ideologically driven refusal to acknowledge Platonic elements in Paul’s thought... Fortunately, things have changed in the last few decades. The work, for example, of Emma Wasserman on moral psychology, George H. van Kooten on what he calls anthropology and M. David Litwa on deification is evidence of a sea change in attitudes among Pauline scholars, or at least some of them” (2015: 143–144). His own recommendations and conclusion are captured in the following words: “Placing Paul in the first century intellectual context means that we need to expand the idea of popular philosophy to include widespread ideas about the physical makeup of the cosmos... The Hellenistic philosophies were still important and established institutions in Paul’s time, but much of the era’s intellectual ferment came from this rather wide-open quest that I have outlined... An impressive case has been made for the Stoic Paul, but a case can also be made for a Paul who drew on the new developments from the end of the second century BCE and through the first century CE that featured the search for ancient truths through Pythagoras, Plato and sometimes Moses, but with key Stoic elements” (Stowers, 2015: 156).

having had some level of education in the written Torah in Tarsus (see Murphy-O'Connor, 1996: 51; Porter, 2008b: 105). There were synagogues in the diaspora responsible for this and such will be true of Tarsus as well (see Murphy-O'Connor, 1996: 47–48). Paul's apparent acquaintance with the Roman mother-tongue and legal system as well as politics may be supporting facts to his Roman citizenship. He displays this knowledge, not only but especially, in the letter to the Romans (see Reasoner, 1993: 140). Yet, the claim of Paul's Roman citizenship is debated in some scholarly circles (Stegemann, 1987; see Roetzel, 1999). It is unlikely that Luke would include such an important fact (on three separate occasions – Acts 16:35-40, 22:22-29 and 25:1-12) without having had some evidence. Nonetheless, there are hints at some evidences to corroborate the citizenship claim when one accords Luke the credibility as an ancient historian (see Adams, 2008: 315–316). And even though the argument against this claim has centred mainly on the assertion that Paul himself never alludes to it, I am of the view that it neither disproves nor makes light of Luke's claim of Paul's Roman citizenship (see Adams, 2008: 326).

Stanley Porter (2008) builds a case for Paul's Greco-Roman education based on the probability of his Roman citizenship (see 2008b: 119).¹⁵ Also, Murphy-O'Connor (1996) has reviewed some of the objections against the argument for Paul's Roman citizenship (see Murphy-O'Connor, 1996: 39–41) concluding as follows: "since there is no evidence of Lukan creativity and no objection based on the epistles, Paul's Roman citizenship should be admitted, particularly since the history of his parents constitutes a plausible historical context for its conferral" (Murphy-O'Connor, 1996: 41; cf. Zetterholm, 2009: 14).¹⁶ In summary, there is no doubt that Paul was immersed and knowledgeable in the Greco-Roman world; its

¹⁵ In his footnote to the article, he adds that: "There is no good reason to doubt Paul's Roman citizenship, even if reference is only found in Acts 16:37; 22:25; 25:11-12; 26:32" (see Porter, 2008b: 97–124).

¹⁶ Zetterholm has remarked that "it is, however, possible that citizenship was conferred on certain individuals from Jewish families who belonged to the social upper crust in some Greco-Roman cities without demanding that they give up their Jewish identity. The statement in Acts concerning Paul's citizenship in Tarsus may therefore, be correct and indicates that Paul came from a family of some standing" (2009: 14).

philosophical ideas and ethnocultural manifestations. Yet, it can also be sustained that he continued to remain and show evidence of allegiance to the God of his ancestors, hence, his identity as *Ioudaios*. Porter and Dyer have expressed this paradox carefully: “As a Jew living in the Hellenized Roman Empire, Paul is something of a microcosm for the blend of cultures from which Christianity emerged. Judaism and its sacred scriptures were foundational for Paul and the early Christian church, yet both were also not only influenced by but an integral part of the Greco-Roman world of the first century” (Porter & Dyer, 2016: 1). These assertions on Paul’s *Ioudaios* identity will need to be unpacked further. The subsequent sections will focus on this development.

2.3 Paul, the Hellenistic *Ioudaios*

2.3.1 On Identity(-ies) and Terms: A brief Debate

The use of the terminology “Jew” along with other categories of identity references such as “Judaism” or “Judaisms” or even “no Judaism” at all, have for over a decade now been argued by certain scholars as not proper for the time in antiquity (typically prior to and during the 1st – 2nd century CE) which they are used by New Testament scholars and scholars of ancient Mediterranean history and the study of religions (Neusner, 1982; Smith, 1998; see arguments from, Johnson Hodge, 2005: 272–273; Satlow, 2006; Mason, 2007). Steve Mason’s (2007) work, for example, borders on revising the popular translations of *Ioudaios/Ioudaismos* and all their other cognates linked with the time in antiquity under discussion. Consequently, he challenges the assertion of the presence of any form of organized religion prior to and within this time and hence, posits that “to themselves and outside observers, the *Ioudaioi* remained what they always had been: Judeans. There was no

ready alternative, since the Graeco-Roman world knew no category of religion, no *-isms* denoting religious allegiance, and no ‘Judaism’” (2007: 511, italics in original).

On the counter-perspective, there are those who have made arguments against these proposals in various ways and with differing foci (Schwartz, 2011; cf. Reinhartz, 2014). Both scholars raise important queries and allude to the academic and historical impact of such choices (see Reinhartz, 2014: 1–2, 3). Adele Reinhartz for example, has critiqued, “let us not make the mistake of defining Jews only in religious terms. Let us rather understand the term Jew as a complex identity marker that encompasses ethnic, political, cultural, genealogical, religious and other elements in proportions that vary among eras, regions of the world, and individuals. Let us not rupture the vital connection – the persistence of identity – between ancient and modern Jews” (2014: 5). Even though, there is fairness of caution in her latter concern, nonetheless, depending on methodology and scholarly discussion, such a negative effect could be avoided. And as valid as her former point is, I argue that it is typically due to the modern connotations and categories embedded in the terminology “Jew” that makes it important to redeem what the ancients perceived when they engaged and negotiated these identities. Seth Schwartz (2011), on the other hand, picks his debate with Jacob Neusner, Jonathan Z. Smith, Steve Mason and Daniel Boyarin, and critiques their varied proposals of “Judaisms” or “Judaismlessness” (see Schwartz, 2011: 208). He is critical of Mason’s exegetical analysis of these terminologies (see 2011: 225). In other instances he seems to compliment Mason’s ingenuity (cf. 2011: 225). However, he explicitly acknowledges that “our modern western language is necessarily inadequate to describe the realities of a radically different culture. But our job is precisely to translate and explain, which necessarily requires that we make use of inherently misleading modern language to describe our subjects” (Schwartz, 2011: 238). In response to Mason’s assertion of no category of religion in the ancient world (see Mason, 2007: 511), Schwartz makes an important concession in his

conclusion that “religion, like ethnicity, nationhood, and culture... such terms must never be used innocently, without full consciousness of their contemporary semantic range, and of the reasons they cannot do full justice to an account of the past” (Schwartz, 2011: 238). Furthermore, I regard it anachronistic and unfair to the ancient community that produced the Gospel of John, for both Reinhartz (2014) and Schwartz (2011: 223) to forcefully read anti-Semitism sentiments (see for example, Reinhartz, 2014: 4) into the Gospel of John (notwithstanding its wrongful use or interpretation) because of the book’s portrayal of the *Ioudaioi* of Jesus’ day. If every scholar is to blame any ancient material or invention for its misuse or abuse, then nothing in our current world will stand the test of proper assessment. Another scholar who has weighed in on this complex ongoing debate is David Miller in his 3-part series - (see Miller, 2010, 2012, 2014), where he attempts a systematic breakdown of all the debates from all sides. Miller makes important contributions pointing out in more detail issues on ethnicity and religion. Nonetheless, in the end he adopts a position in favor of continuity and maintaining “Jew” as fair grounds of settlement of *Ioudaios* (see Miller, 2014: 255–259). Many of his reasons for this concession are in line with same ones asserted by Adele Reinhartz (2014) which I have already reviewed above.

Fundamentally, Steve Mason’s (2007) work has opened up an important aspect of the developments in both the Maccabean era and the New Testament world. He may have shown that both “Judaism” and “Jew” are rather modern Western-influenced and constructed categories of identities that may be far removed from the time in antiquity with which historians, scholars of religious studies and New Testament scholars associate them. Continuing to render or translate these ancient Greek terminologies with our modern categories (Jew and Judaism) will cause modern scholarship to miss out on the intent, content and context within which these terminologies operated and were used. It is an important call that scholarship on ancient studies need to acknowledge.

In this research work, except in cases of citing the work of other scholars, I will generally subscribe to the transliterated forms of these important terminologies: *Ioudaios/Ioudaioi/Ioudaismos* and complement them (only on few occasions) with their respective proposed translations Judean/Judeans/Judaizing (similar to the view held by Johnson Hodge (2005: 273)). Mason himself acknowledges the former approach as “the simplest solution” (2007: 511) but chooses to disregard it as a “dubious merit in translation projects, and cumbersome in other efforts to make the fruits of scholarship more broadly accessible” (Mason, 2007: 511). There are still difficulties with even a minimal use of Judean (see Johnson Hodge, 2007: 11–15). But again, it is preferable because “‘Judean,’ audibly similar to the Greek *Ioudaioi*, conveys the crucial connection between people and place, *Ioudaioi* and *Ioudaia*” (Johnson Hodge, 2007: 12, italics in original). In the discussions above, I regard the views of both poles important to the ongoing complex debate. Nonetheless, serving the core nature and objective of this research as a literary project focusing on translation (and linguistic) studies, it is often best practice to maintain the depth and import of certain complex terminologies transliterated, with a footnote (where necessary) to provide ethical clarifications. And it is in this view, that Steve Mason’s realization to the matter is a great contribution to scholarship, even though I do not completely subscribe to his thorough and radical proposal of “Judean” as a viable replacement; it should be a gradual paradigm shift and ongoing discussion in scholarship. The debate is far from settled.

2.3.2 On Identity(-ies): Paul, the Hellenistic *Ioudaios*

After discussing Paul in a Greco-Roman context, it is necessary to discuss him in terms of his *Ioudaios* identity (which is also the main focus of this study). The following words by E.P. Sanders certainly reveal the complexity of this discourse: “In the case of Paul, a Greek-speaking Jew of the first century, there has always been a major question of whether to read

his letters primarily in the context of Greco-Roman culture or that of Judaism” (2009: 74). Then, again he counters with the following, “but there is no single entity called Greco-Roman culture. It was diverse. Judaism was also diverse. If one reads Paul against the backdrop of Philo and ancient Jewish symbols and art, for example, one discovers *a* Paul: the one discussed by Erwin Goodenough and Samuel Sandmel” (Sanders, 2009: 74, italics in original). On the other hand, he continues, “W.D. Davies wrote about Paul as a Rabbinic Jew, which led to *a* Paul who was noticeably different from the Paul of Goodenough and Sandmel—though both Pauls are Jewish” (Sanders, 2009: 74, italics in original).

In my view, the crux of the matter, then, is the fact that irrespective of the hermeneutic lens chosen to view Paul and the variety of outcomes of such exercises, of certainty and primary focus is that Paul was *Ioudaios*, was raised as such and most probably lived as such all his life, even as an apostle of the gospel message (cf. Aune, 1993: 793).

As mentioned, this research aims to explore the evidence of Paul’s *Ioudaios* background, also to find how such knowledge could be applied in the dual fields of Bible translation and contemporary readings of Scripture. We will attend to his communication via, what we now have as, his first letter to the community of Jesus-followers in the house-gatherings at Corinth. Investigation of the literary context is assumed to hold potential for understanding the complex mind and world of Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles. The complexity of this discussion is laid out by the fact that Paul, with his *Ioudaios* background, nonetheless wrote extensively in the common Greek of his day. There are socio-cultural and hermeneutical layers to the problem; but there is also a literary dimension to the discussion, and this is a problem tied to the matter of Paul’s identity. The questions to be probed include: how did Paul perceive himself even though he communicated in the everyday Greek of the time? Also, what manner of literary-rhetorical identity should or could be assessed from such a

communication activity? Several other facets of these questions will be explored in the next chapter.

Paul was born to Judean parents and in his own words he asserts, περιτομῆ ὀκταήμερος, ἐκ γένους Ἰσραήλ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν, Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων, κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος, (Philippians 3:5 NA²⁸). The expression Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων could mean that Paul was born to Judean parents and was not of mixed birth.¹⁷ Concerning this expression, Porter describes it as “probably a linguistic distinction for a Jew who knew Hebrew or at least Aramaic, or possibly a designation for one descended from Jews who spoke the language (though he clearly uses Greek)” (Porter, 2008a: 1). The evidence from Philippians 3:5, unfortunately, is viewed sometimes in a perspective that makes it lose the import of reflecting Paul’s *Ioudaios* background, especially when interpreters or commentators (wrongfully assuming Paul has discarded or cast off these identity traits for a “Christian” identity) fail to position Paul’s rhetoric hermeneutically in vs.7 [Ἄλλ’] ἅτινα ἦν μοι κέρδη, ταῦτα ἤγημαι διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ζημίαν, within the broader context of Chapter 2:5ff. Significantly, Murphy-O’Connor, partly relying on “J.B. Lightfoot’s perceptive insight that Paul’s *ethnocultural* privileges in Philippians 3:5 are arranged on an ascending scale” (1996: 36, words in italics mine), has related what seems to be the importance of this text for understanding the depth of Paul’s *Ioudaios* background.¹⁸ Other Scripture references from Paul’s primary letters that give witness to his background include Romans 11:1 and Galatians 1:13-14. Certainly, the context and present tense of the verb εἰμί used in Romans 11:1b - καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλίτης εἰμί, ἐκ

¹⁷ W.R. Stegner suggests that “he may have meant his blood was pure in that he had no Gentile ancestry. More probably, he was contrasting himself with Hellenists or Greek-speaking Jews. Thereby, he was saying that he was taught Hebrew in the home” (1993a: 504).

¹⁸ He expresses the following: “A child circumcised on the eighth day could still be descended from proselytes. But Paul is of the race of Israel. Some Israelites were unable to provide proof of their genealogy. But Paul knew he was of the tribe of Benjamin. The land of Benjamin, however, included Jerusalem where the influence of Hellenism was particularly manifest in the many Jews who spoke Greek. But Paul came of a family which, despite its location in the Diaspora, retained the ancient tongue of the Jews” (Murphy-O’Connor, 1996: 36–37).

σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν, supports the assertion that Paul consistently perceived himself as *Ioudaios*.

For his Judean upbringing, the discussion often begins with Luke's reference to Paul (Acts 22:3) as being ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιήλ πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν τοῦ πατρῶου νόμου, ζηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων τοῦ θεοῦ καθὼς πάντες ὑμεῖς ἐστε σήμερον·(NA²⁸) (my translation: but in this city I was brought up, under the feet of Gamaliel, trained strictly according to the law of our ancestors, being zealous for God just as you are today). E.P. Sanders (2009) opposes this view as reflecting Paul's Judean education. For him, the contents of the text "show only that Paul was not a Palestinian Sadducee; they do not prove that he was a Palestinian Pharisee" (Sanders, 2009: 77). And even though he does not deny Paul as a Pharisee, he makes the assertion that "there are *no signs of a distinctively Palestinian Pharisaic education*" and concludes that he does not accept "the view that Paul as a small child moved to Jerusalem and was brought up and educated within Palestinian Pharisaism" (Sanders, 2009: 77, italics in original). Besides not making much of Paul's Greek education,¹⁹ either, Sanders is strongly of the view that Paul's Judean education may have taken place primarily in Greek and involved, among others, mainly the memorization of a Greek version of the Scriptures of Israel (see Sanders, 2009: 79–80). He chooses to remain agnostic about whether Paul could have possibly "memorized the Bible in Hebrew" (Sanders, 2009: 82) or whether he had any sophisticated type of Greco-Roman education. However, as much as Sanders doubts Paul's Judean education, especially in Hebrew, his own claims about Paul's Greek education similarly remains uncertain, since this cannot be argued conclusively based only on his letters. Paul's quoting mostly from the Greek version of the Scriptures of Israel does not necessarily imply his lack of knowledge of

¹⁹ According to Sanders he proposes that "Paul was well-educated in the Bible but has a mediocre education in the Greek language and probably not much instruction in classical Greek literature. I doubt that he knew much Greek literature because he shows no inclination to quote it" (Sanders, 2009: 79). This view is not supported by scholars such as Stanley E. Porter (see Porter, 2008b: 97–124).

the Hebrew version. Consequently, when Sanders deduces Paul's source of Scripture quotations as based only on memorization and does not discuss the possibility of evidence for sources such as anthologies, collections, testimonia and so on as possible additional sources of his quotations,²⁰ renders his assertions uncertain and skewed (see discussions by, Albl, 1999; Lincicum, 2008).

A careful look again at the text of Acts 22:3 shows the possibility of Paul's Judean education taking place in Jerusalem and not (only) in Tarsus.²¹ The connection Porter shares on this is worth noting: "Even though the tradition may be later, this pattern of development is consistent with Paul being reared in a Jewish home in Tarsus and learning the Scriptures while being educated in a Greek grammar school, then, after his Bar Mitzvah (or the equivalent of the time), going to Jerusalem to complete his education in Jewish law and related matters" (Porter, 2008b: 102). Drawing on arguments from Birger Gerhardsson, Porter asserts that Paul would have been "instructed in the written Torah in Tarsus" and then later in Jerusalem, "to continue his education with Gamaliel the rabbi on the oral Torah" (Porter, 2008b: 103). I consider this likely to have taken place both in Greek and Hebrew or Aramaic as well. Additionally, paraphrasing W.R. Stegner, contrary to the dialectical perspective about Judean ethno-culture in Palestine and the diaspora propounded by the old school of thought, recent studies have revealed the seamless variety that permeated both systems (see Stegner, 1993a: 504). In fact, Judean ethno-culture in Palestine was as equally Hellenized and syncretistic as that in the diaspora (see Stegner, 1993a: 504).²² Based on this, Stegner shares that "while Greek was the language of Alexandrian and Egyptian Jewry, the

²⁰ Stanley E. Porter has given attention to this possibility in his article. See Porter (2008b: 97–124).

²¹ This is a view which has been already iterated above.

²² Elsewhere, Stegner has elaborated that "recent scholarship has emphasized points of convergence rather than divergence. Palestinian Judaism was neither self-contained nor monolithic; it was marked by variety and shared points of contact with the Judaism of the Diaspora" (1993b: 212). Later, he discusses what he sees as points of convergence and divergence between both versions (see Stegner, 1993b: 212).

language situation in Syria was different; Syria later produced an Aramaic literature. Geographically, Tarsus is quite close to Syria” (Stegner, 1993a: 504). And consequently, “Jerome reports that Paul’s parents came from Gischala in Galilee. If Jerome is correct, Paul could very well have spoken Hebrew or Aramaic in his home” (Stegner, 1993a: 504). In Acts 22:2, Luke provides corroborating evidence which indicates that Paul may have been fluent in Aramaic. E.P. Sanders is not the only skeptic about this review of Paul’s Judean background. In a more recent publication, Michael L. Satlow, although affirming Paul’s Judean educational background as fluent in Aramaic but not Hebrew (see Satlow, 2018: 258, 263), has done a “radical” reconstruction of the account in Acts and has posited complete distrust of Luke’s biographical account of Paul. He denies the possibility of Paul’s birth in Tarsus based on his view that Paul himself never mentions it (see Satlow, 2018: 259); he also rejects the fact of Paul being a Pharisee in spite of the reference from Philippians 3:6;²³ consequently disclaiming that Paul may have gained his knowledge of the Scripture from that background. Thereby he downplays Paul’s formal Judean education in the Scriptures of Israel and purports rather a partial Aramaic and Greek education for Paul, gained from home-schooling in Jerusalem and through his travels in the Mediterranean world. Satlow accuses Luke of providing an embellished account of Paul’s biography and describes it as a “smart reconstruction based on evidence similar to our own but does not possess independent facts that throw any light on Paul’s upbringing” (Satlow, 2018: 266, see further discussion, : 264–265). The main objective of his article is a discussion of Paul’s use of Scripture and through his reconstruction of the account of Acts on Paul’s life, he attempts to provide his view on some of the contemporary questions that scholars have faced on the subject. He offers

²³ On this issue, Satlow reviews the Greek *κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος*, rendered “according to (the) Law, a Pharisee” and asserts that the expression “according to the law” does not explicitly mean “to be” a Pharisee and goes on to explain that Paul might have meant “according to established customs, I follow the Pharisees” (Satlow, 2018: 260). He compares it to an expression used by Josephus which he claims is similar to Paul’s. In my view, this may be over-stretching the argument.

critiques of Paul's use of Scripture that would be reviewed later in this research work (see Chapter 4). However, portions of his conclusion that are more related to this stage of the work include his assertion that based on Paul's scanty or minimal direct quotes from the Hebrew version of the Scriptures of Israel, "there is substantially more evidence...that Paul knew Scripture in Greek" (2018: 270) and that "Paul almost never cites the Hebrew version of Scripture because he did not know Hebrew" (2018: 271). And finally, Satlow (2018) asserts, drawing on E.E. Ellis, that Paul's method of citation is akin to that practiced in Palestine than the Diaspora (see Satlow, 2018: 272–273).

As a response, it would suffice to indicate that Paul's letters, that were written specifically to Jesus-followers in primarily non-*Ioudaios* dominated communities, are not enough to refute a possible knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic on Paul's part. Downplaying Paul's Pharisaic background in spite of internal and external evidence from his own letters does not provide the conclusive responses to questions scholars have raised on his use of Scripture.

On the other hand, to delimit Paul's Hellenistic upbringing and learning in the Greek literary world radically is too extreme a line to tow. To reiterate, for this research, the position posited, even from a literary approach, is that Paul was raised in a Hellenistic city of Tarsus where he gained some level of education after which he went to Jerusalem and trained in the sect of the Pharisees and became a Pharisee and not merely a follower of their ways. Hebrew, Aramaic, Latin and Greek are all open options of languages that Paul may have spoken and the probability of that evidence should not be suppressed. This "traditional" approach can still be defended while a strong argument can be made for the issues encountered in Paul's use of Scripture. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 discuss these issues further.

The two immediate subheadings discussed above, bring this chapter to a very crucial stage; a stage of weighing the question; to what end did Paul's Judean educational background and for that matter, upbringing serve the early Jesus-movement and his involvement in it?

Another crucial aspect or substratum of Paul's *Ioudaios* identity arises, viz. his ethnocultural identity in *Ioudaismos*. For the objective of this research, it is important to establish the notion that, even though Paul lived and was influenced by a broad Hellenistic or Greco-Roman context, this context did not in any way undermine or suppress his *Ioudaios* worldview of whatever variety. The crucial summary statement at this point is not that we ignore all the backgrounds that come with Paul's life; be it *Ioudaios* or Hellenistic or Roman or all three. All these strands play various important roles in understanding his identity, interpreting his writings and exploring his relevance for contemporary recipients (in my case Christianity on the African continent). The key highlight of this research is establishing or affirming that Paul must be approached, primarily from the standpoint of his *Ioudaios* identity, especially in his use of the Scriptures of Israel, and consequently, for Scripture translation today.²⁴ Substantively, it is possible to posit that everything he did and achieved was engineered from this core *Ioudaios* identity trait.

With this point established, the next cauldron of contention is positioning Paul within the contexts of the *Ioudaismos* of his time and hence, addressing the issue of the terminology of early Christianity when applied to Paul's identity and his communities of Jesus-followers in the first century CE.

²⁴ James C. Miller arrives at a similar conclusion on this subject. His conclusive statements are worth noting here: "My own proposal for a way forward lies with investigating Paul's self-understanding as "apostle to the gentiles" within a fully Jewish framework, but one that understands what we call "early Christianity" as a particular manifestation of first-century Jewishness. We are well aware of the varieties of Judaism that existed at this time, as the recent propensity to speak of "Judaisms" in the plural attests. Reading Paul and his mission as one interpretation of faithfulness to Jewish traditions offers, I believe, a more reliable historical framework within which to conduct our investigation" (Miller, 2011: 50).

2.4 Paul's Ethnocultural Identity: Second Temple *Ioudaismos* versus Notions of Early Christianity

For some decades now, there has been a growing concern for Paul's *Ioudaios* identity as reflecting in typical fashion the context of his ethnocultural self-awareness in *Ioudaismos*. Prior to this epoch, dating from the 3rd Century CE into the era of the Protestant Reformation and propounded largely through filters of Western (Roman Catholic) and/or popular Lutheran theology, the conventional position in biblical studies as much as in theology was that early Christianity broke away from its Judean roots. And obviously, at the centre of this great contention was one catalyst, Paul. This school of thought was perpetuated over centuries centred around Paul's polemic and personality, seen and read variedly in anti-Semitic perspectives; a typical attempt at "Christianizing" Paul. Hence, Paul was placed strongly in a "Christian-conversion motif" identity as against a professing *Ioudaios* who maintained active participation in the ethnocultural heritage of his ancestors (see Zetterholm, 2009: 33–67).

Reclaiming Paul's *Ioudaios* identity within the varied Second Temple *Ioudaismos* of his time is somewhat controversial: it has been critiqued that such attempts to reclaim Paul's *Ioudaios* identity present an impossible task, because we cannot ascertain which of the myriad Hellenistic and Judean ethnocultural porous interfaces could have thoroughly influenced his personality and writings or even defined him (see Sanders, 2009). The conclusion of this critique is that aligning Paul to any one particular influence (whether *Ioudaios* or Hellenistic) is an aberration of facts. Nonetheless, succumbing to these criticisms puts Pauline scholarly works in danger of what has become a subsequent anachronistic reading of Paul. W.D. Davies responds succinctly:

To-day it has become clear, however, that Paul was influenced not only by the religion of his fathers, but also by the religious movements of the Hellenistic world of his day; that both Hellenism and Judaism were his tutors unto Christ. The extent, however, to which he was indebted to the one or to the other will probably always be a matter of conjecture and debate, because in the fusions of the first century we cannot split Hellenistic, Jewish and other factors. In the present work we shall not seek to deny all Hellenistic influence upon him; we

shall merely attempt to prove that Paul belonged to the main stream of first-century Judaism, and that elements in his thoughts, which are often labelled as Hellenistic, might well be derived from Judaism (Davies, 1980: 1).

His objective for undertaking his kind of study fits well with what this current research attempts to achieve, viz. identifying *Ioudaios* concepts that Paul communicated through his canonically first letter to the Jesus-followers in Corinth. In this context, it must be reiterated as well that, not just Paul as a person, but the entire Judean ethnocultural life of his day (whether Palestinian or diaspora) was impacted by Hellenism. Nor did the Judean ethno-culture sit passively with this permeation of foreign culture. Evidently, Hellenistic culture had its fair share of collision and rub-off with Judean ethno-culture. That is a viable explanation for proselytes and God-fearers (either Greeks or Romans) who felt differing attraction towards and participation in the Judean ethno-culture. Nonetheless, it was still a recognized and identifiable Judean ethno-culture in its varied, dynamic and diverse representations. In similar light, notwithstanding the kind of influence that Paul's multi-ethnocultural worlds may have had on him, such influence does not subvert his continual identity as a Pharisaic *Ioudaios* who "integrated and reinterpreted (not ignored) the rich traditions – Old Testament, Apocalyptic, Pharisaic – of his people in the light of Christ" (Davies, 1980: xxxvi). These sentiments, then, also undergird the importance of such a research work.

Setting the discussion on Paul's Judean ethnocultural identity on this path is crucial because it enables us to situate not only Paul but also the entire praxis of the New Testament and the Jesus movement of which he (Paul) is a major player, in their rightful context. Questions that come up include: Was Paul a Christian converted from the Judaism of his time? In what mold of identity do we place *Ioudaios* and Gentiles who became a part of the Jesus movement in the first and early second century CE? And consequently, what implications do responses to these questions have in the contemporary reading of Paul's letters to recipients in multifaceted contexts? Scholars such as W.D. Davies (1980), Mark D. Nanos & Magnus

Zetterholm (2015), Pamela Eisenbaum (2009) and Judith M. Lieu (2004) have been vocal on these issues.

Firstly, there are issues of anachronism which impinge on the questions above. This is because the “Christianity” manifested in the first century and into the late second century CE was neither normative nor homogeneous or even monolithic, so the use of the term itself presents a difficulty for New Testament studies (see Runesson, 2015: 53–77). The canonized early Christianity that emerged nearly after the late third and fourth centuries CE was not a reflection of what pertained in the first century CE of Paul. Some of the contemporary readings of Paul with (typically Western) Christian sentiments that have made him the hero of Christian “triumph over Judaism”²⁵ are highly overrated and, in fact, misplaced and amount to a misreading of the Apostle (and a consequent sidelining of the key concerns of his writings). Secondly, there is some certainty that at some later point and maybe towards the end of the second century CE, there was a beginning of the parting of ways between what is now known as Judaism, and Christianity (see Lieu, 2004: 2; Dunn, 2006) and hence, an early development of what has today become a Christian identity (see Lieu, 2004).²⁶ Nonetheless,

²⁵ An expression used by John G. Gager (2015).

²⁶ On the other side of the discussion, there are scholars who argue against any such parting of the ways between these two religions. The publication edited by Adam H. Becker & Annette Yoshiko Reed (2007) titled: *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, offer such an example. In her contribution to this publication, Paula Fredriksen (2007) questions the assumptions of this assertion by focusing on what she terms “Mediterranean civic life” (see Fredriksen, 2007: 35–48) which she affirms displayed “continuing Jewish-Gentile intimacy” (Fredriksen, 2007: 48). For her then, this whole parting of the ways was ideological propaganda carried out “by an intellectual minority...beginning, perhaps, in the early second century CE” (2007: 62). Nonetheless, her verdict on the, “when, then, did ‘the ways’ part?” (2007: 61) surmises that “actual, effective segregation (which will facilitate targeted aggression) lies outside our period, well off into the Middle Ages” (2007: 62). In this light she answers “How, then, can we best respond to the question, ‘When was the Parting of the Ways?’” with another question: “What Parting of the Ways?” (2007: 63). See Fredriksen (2007) for her discussion. Another scholar who has paid attention, (but probably more gently than Paula Fredriksen) to this “Partings of the Ways” is Judith Lieu (2016). For Lieu, “the Parting of the Ways” is useful as a Christian theological construct but not as a historical or sociological model for unwrapping the events of antiquity between these two religious systems (see Lieu, 2016: 31–49). Nonetheless, she concedes, “(at least, let us agree, by the time of Constantine) in which Judaism and Christianity are recognizable as two separate and independent systems: a historical datum” (Lieu, 2016: 38).

This research is focused on the literary work of Paul situated within first century CE, a period which both sides of the discussion agree was certainly no defined and formalized line of demarcation between Judean

while that very particular point in time or place in history is very difficult to ascertain, one should perhaps allow for a longer process rather than an instantaneous moment (see Dunn, 2006: xi); there is enough surety that it did not happen during Paul's time.²⁷ The Apostle of Jesus to the Gentiles may, therefore, have regarded himself still a member of the Pharisaic sect and hence, a Judean actively contributing to the faith and heritage of his ancestors.

Therefore, it can be readily established that, amidst various current debates, Paul did not "convert" or "apostatize" from his own *Ioudaios* ethnocultural heritage of his day, as the terminology would imply through Western Christianity conversion models, but rather, his experience and theologizing concerning his revelation about the Messiah were all self-manifestations of his faith and polemics that could well have found room within the vibrant ethnocultural milieu of the *Ioudaismos* of his day that was highly accommodating of diverse views and dissensions.²⁸ From a chronology of scholarship on these issues, Krister Stendahl (1963) is commonly recognized as the first to have begun hinting at the need to shift away from this Western-Lutheran approach to Pauline studies and interpretation (see Johnson Hodge, 2007; Zetterholm, 2009). According to Stendahl, even though "in the history of Western culture – the Apostle Paul has been hailed as a hero of the introspective conscience" (1963: 199), "a fresh look at the Pauline writings themselves shows that Paul was equipped

ethnocultural expression or Hellenism, and those (whether Judeans or Gentiles) who had committed to become Jesus-followers.

²⁷ Dunn has rightly emphasized that "most accept that Christianity functioned initially as a sect within second Temple Judaism, 'the sect of the Nazarenes' (Acts 24.5, 14), so that the question whether the ways would or should part was by no means an obvious conclusion to be drawn during the first generation and beyond" (Dunn, 2006: xii).

²⁸ The accounts in Acts about Paul's Damascus Road encounter are usually at the centre of these debates. Corroborating from Paul's own writings about the encounter, especially from Galatians 1 and Romans 1, it is verifiable that Paul viewed this as a call to serve God with renewed revelation: a call comparable to that of the prophets of his ancestors; Jeremiah or Isaiah. Just like these Prophets of old, Paul evidently saw himself as commissioned and sent to proclaim the gospel to the nations. Krister Stendahl (1963) has expressed the same opinion in the following words: "These observations agree well with the manner in which both Paul himself and the Acts of the Apostles describe his "conversion" as a call to become the Apostle to and of the Gentiles. This was the task for which he – in the manner of the prophets of old – had been earmarked by God from his mother's womb (Gal. 1:15, cf. Acts 9:15). There is not – as we usually think – first a conversion, and then a call to apostleship; there is only the call to the work among the Gentiles" (Stendahl, 1963: 204–205).

with what in our eyes must be called a rather ‘robust’ conscience” (1963: 200). After Stendahl, E.P. Sanders (1983) and subsequently, James D.G. Dunn (2008), who was to be attributed with coining the expression “the New Perspective” on Paul, both made sterling contributions to this discussion on setting Pauline scholarship on a path of restoring its first century CE context, relevance and meaning (see Punt, 2020). Still pushing the frontiers further, the contemporary wave of change in Pauline scholarship is popularly called the radical new perspective on Paul or the Paul within Judaism perspective (see Zetterholm (2009) for a survey of developments in Pauline studies over recent decades). This research, so far and in subsequent chapters, will reflect various aspects of this perspective of “Paul within Judaism”.²⁹

The truth and relevance of these statements makes it important then to discuss the paradigm of *Ioudaios* identity within which Paul undertook his Gentile missions typically in his use of Scripture and for that matter, identifiable *Ioudaios* concepts and thought-categories. In Chapter 3 a complementary aspect of these issues will be addressed.

The issues for the next section will involve a cross-cultural discussion of Paul’s mission. This work attempts to establish that, in his cross-cultural engagement and communication with the Jesus-followers of his Gentile communities, Paul assumed the identity of a cross-cultural mediator; an identity that fits the model of a Hellenistic *Ioudaios* translator-interpreter. It is, consequently based on this that I propose that discussions on Paul’s use of Scripture and subsequently *Ioudaios* concepts should begin from the substratum of a translator-interpreter identity (with a linguistic outlook) and from there, move into a hermeneutical or theological dimension. In his use of Scripture and *Ioudaios* concepts, Paul should be approached firstly linguistically (for communication purposes) admitting a cross-cultural motif and then

²⁹ Discussions on these “perspectives” are important frameworks for shaping one’s position and method. In this research, I acknowledge the impact of these discussions in Pauline studies, nonetheless, my attention will be differently oriented; not necessarily focusing on the debates that come with these “perspectives” (see Punt, 2020).

subsequently, be appropriated hermeneutically or theologically vis-à-vis intertextuality. This proposal will be engaged further in Chapters 4 and 5.

2.5 Approaching Paul's Identity: A Paradigm for Translation Activity

With what self-consciousness or self-understanding did Paul perceive himself as he engaged the texts and concepts of his multi-ethnocultural world radically and cross-culturally? Punt (2012) discusses the issue of identity as related to Pauline communities in his article “Identity, Memory, and Scriptural Warrant: Arguing Paul’s Case” probing a similar issue of concern (see Punt, 2012: 25–53).³⁰ Related to Paul’s use of Scripture, Punt deduces that “Paul’s invocation and reworking of the Scriptures provided a memory map for plotting his own and his communities’ identity” (Punt, 2012: 44). This implies that from a critical analysis of Paul’s use of the Scriptures of Israel (and for that matter, *Ioudaios* concepts) it is possible to map out his self-identity in this activity. As Paul interpreted and re-interpreted the texts and concepts of his Judean and Hellenistic world, he inadvertently, assumed the role of a cross-cultural mediator (specifically a translator-interpreter). Among other things, his tasks (as a translator-interpreter) included a repackaging and re-interpreting of these Scriptures and concepts of Israel, for varied reasons (linguistic, sociological, political, theological and so on) and purposes (*skopos*). This was, at its basic level, whether consciously or unconsciously, a task categorically undertaken in the framework identical to translation activity. B.Y. Quarshie has mentioned that “translation from one language to another cannot take place without some amount of interpretation. Conversely, it is fair to say that the hermeneutical process entails

³⁰ He inquires: “to what extent did Paul, consciously or otherwise, engage in cultural formation? Did he intend that his use of the Scriptures for the sake of cultural memory would leave a lasting legacy in the form of practices, documents, and so on that would become cultural artifacts? Even if Paul himself did not deliberately position his letters as artifacts of cultural memory, we know from the Deutero-Paulines that his initial efforts in using the Scriptures to negotiate identity soon resulted in his letters becoming cultural markers for the developing Christian community” (Punt, 2012: 49).

translation” (Quarshie, 2016: 1). Hence, “Bible (Scripture) translation and Bible (Scripture) interpretation are, therefore, so intertwined as to be inseparable” (2016: 1, words in brackets mine). For “they both involve the attempt to transmit information embedded with meaning that is intended to generate understanding, which then becomes an avenue for new insights both for the translator/interpreter and their audience” (Quarshie, 2016: 1). It follows then that, Paul, whether self-consciously or not, apparently played a role identifiable with that of a translator-interpreter, mediating between his *Ioudaios* ethnocultural world and that of a multifaceted one to which he felt commissioned to communicate the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Roy E. Ciampa (2012) has made a preliminary case for this important outlook of viewing the discussions and issues concerning Paul’s use of Scripture from the perspective of translation studies (see Ciampa, 2012a: 293–318). For Ciampa “some of our questions about why Paul interprets the Scriptures the way he does may never be answered if our focus is limited to shifting back and forth between those interpretations and the texts being interpreted” (2012a: 300). His publication will be engaged with later in this study (in Chapter 4). Conclusively, unravelling and negotiating Paul’s *Ioudaios* identity in the light of the task of a cross-cultural mediator vis-à-vis a translator-interpreter, is key to understanding his appropriation of the *Ioudaios* concepts that will be discussed further in this study.

2.6 Reading/Understanding Paul’s *Ioudaios* Identity for an African Christian Audience: Hermeneutics of Identity and Bible Translation in Africa

The final question at this stage is: what implications or import do these discussions have for Scripture translation and cross-cultural engagement of the Christian faith in Africa? The Gospel re-visited the shores of Africa through the 19th century Western missionary enterprise. Prior to this era, the Scriptures had been active and alive on the continent as far as from the epoch-making Greek translation of the Hebrew Pentateuch in Alexandria through to the 2nd –

4th century CE. Later, the presence of early Christian leaders such as Athanasius, Tertullian, Origen, Augustine and others also shaped early Christianity from the context of the African continent.³¹ Africa has a complex and unique history as far as the Scriptures, early Christianity and contemporary Christianity is concerned (see Bongmba, 2016). While complex, it is nevertheless deeply rooted in the activity of Scripture translation.³² Two issues must be looked at under this discussion concerning the theme of translator-interpreter identity (whether related directly to Paul or with respect to the negotiations of identity in his communities).

Firstly, re-activating Paul's *Ioudaios* identity (especially for African audiences) is crucial to discussing the problem of identity that lies at the heart of the Christian faith and praxis in Africa. As much as Paul lived in an ethnoculturally pluralistic world, today Christian practice in Africa similarly faces the challenge of cultural identity in the light of westernization, secularization and globalization, which have facilitated a pluralistic culture. The positive contemporary socio-political and technological impact of these cultural effects cannot be over-emphasized. Nonetheless, a major issue for redress is their subtle conscious or unconscious erosion and suppression of African primal religious and cultural identity(ies) and imagination. The subsequent, popularization and assertion of Western thought-categories at

³¹ R.S. Sugirtharajah has established this fact as follows: "In the later years of the second century and the early years of the third, there not only existed Christian congregations in North African cities but also far into the desert. Tunisia produced three great Latin Church figures: Tertullian (160-212 CE), Cyprian (200-58) and Augustine (354-430). Though there were persecutions, Christian communities and congregations continued to grow. The numbers of illustrious African bishops, articulate speakers and erudite scholars who graced the ecumenical assemblies affirmed the vibrancy of the African Church. Africa was the centre of great biblical activity. Egypt became known for its translation work. The Greek version of the Hebrew Bible – the Septuagint – was produced there. The Hebrew Law books were translated into Greek in the Egyptian city of Alexandria about 285-247 BCE. More than a thousand years before the English had their own vernacular Bible in the form of the Authorized Version, Africans had their own in Sahidic, an Egyptian language. It was this hive of translation activity which earned Africa the title, "the cradle of Bible translation." Cities like Carthage, Hippo and Alexandria were known for their great deliberations on the Bible. Clement, Origen, Cyprian and Augustine were the pioneers in biblical exposition and initiated a variety of reading methods" (2001: 30–31).

³² For example, in the particular case of Ghana, Ekem (2011) has traced the complex and intriguing history behind the translated Scriptures into four mother-tongues in Ghana, then the Gold Coast (see Ekem, 2011).

the religious and cultural levels tend toward the detriment of authentic African Christian theological manifestation(s).

The researcher is familiar with the criticism that comes with the use of the terminology “primal,” used here in the expression “African primal religious and cultural identity(ies) and imagination,” but also in its widely used form “primal religions.” Here used, “‘primal’ is not a euphemism for ‘primitive,’ nor are any evolutionistic undertones intended. The word helpfully underlines two features of the religions of the peoples indicated: their historical anteriority and their basic, elemental status in human experience” (Walls, 1996: 120–121). For recent decades now, it has become untenable and derogatory to describe the religious and cultural phenomena among a people with terms such as: primitive, primordial, pagans, native, tribal, traditional, animism and so on. Unfortunately, these were evolutionary-driven condescending designations that the West (both academia and religious institutions) categorized the religious and cultural phenomena of all others; Africans, North Americans, South Americans, Asia and the Pacific (see Walls, 1996: 120). Gillian M. Bediako (2009) has traced the origins of this negative Western perception tied with the development of Old Testament Biblical scholarship in her article “Old Testament Religion as Primal Substructure of Christianity: Questions and Issues.” The gap left after the rejection of the above terminologies brought about a more careful and sensitive search of the nature and structure of the religious and cultural phenomena of these groups (but today it is applied on a more universal scale of all cultures in the world) and so, even though he was not the first to use this term, Harold W. Turner (1977) became its most popular proponent (see Pym, 2008: 60). His groundbreaking work on this subject was “a six-feature framework for understanding primal religions as authentically religious, rather than as merely epiphenomena of the social organization of simple or preliterate societies” (Bediako, 2014: 93).

Certainly, there has been general criticisms against its use by scholars such as James L. Cox (see the discussion by Pym, 2008: 60–69). Nonetheless, the terminology “primal” is a very positive step away (not without its weaknesses) from the negative past of Western-thought categorization of others. Pym observes that,

the designation ‘primal religions’ may be seen to have value for describing Africa’s so-called tribal and traditional religious phenomena in a general sense to the extent that it is empirically and historically accurate. Generalisations (*sic*) are inevitable when seeking to group religions according to similarities, and it is the task of those studying religion from a theological perspective, to ensure that similar religious phenomena are grouped not on the basis of unfounded assumptions, but according to facts that can be shown to be true. To the extent to which ‘primal religions’ is a designation that does this, it is an appropriate way of referring to the religious phenomena in question (Pym, 2008: 66).

Therefore, in this research work, I engage this terminology to draw relevance to the rich pre-Christian religious and cultural phenomena of African communities that must not be neglected or superseded but rather critically tapped into as a vital tool to recovering and sustaining genuine African Christian identity(ies).³³

Kwame Bediako (1994) has discussed this concern on these issues from his own perspective. The relevance and value of Paul and his theology for theological praxis and Christian mission in Africa, as far as the New Testament and Christianity in Africa is concerned, cannot be over-stated. In this chapter, I have argued that, contrary to previous assumptions, modern scholarship on Paul has tilted more in the direction that he never abandoned his *Ioudaios* ethnocultural heritage for a so-called “Christian” one. Paul’s own Semitic primal worldview (with all its Hellenistic manifestations) provided a viable substratum to his confidence in the gospel message of the Messiah. And this is why rediscovering Paul’s *Ioudaios* identity and situating him within the ethnocultural heritage of his ancestors is a crucial paradigm for Christian identity in Africa. Africans need not abandon nor trade-in their ethnocultural heritage for a so-called “western Christian” one in order to manifest the facets of the

³³ See Benhardt Y. Quarshie (2009), Gillian Bediako (2000) and Kabiro wa Gatumu (2009) for such fruitful application.

Christian faith. Like Paul, African Christians must negotiate, re-evaluate and engage with our own cultural identities as we discover who we are in Christ.

Consequently, negotiating Paul's *Ioudaios* identity coalesced with his mission-task identity as a translator-interpreter, especially the first century CE Gentile communities, has great relevance to mission and the Christian faith in Africa and for that matter Scripture translation. The importance of Scripture translation in and for mission has been addressed ably by Lamin Sanneh (2009) in his ground-breaking work. In the same work, Sanneh has shown how Paul's identity and methodology of effective cross-cultural engagement was crucial for the effectiveness of the Gentile mission in the first century CE (see Sanneh, 2009: 28–40). I will focus on Paul's audience and discuss these matters further in Chapter 3 and conclusively, in Chapter 6.

As a literary activity translation predates Christianity of whatever form, and certainly it predates Paul and his literary works. In a cross-cultural mission, translation activity (when engaged efficiently) enables the translator-interpreter to put hermeneutics in the hands of the receptor culture. This renders the recipient culture not merely passive observers but rather active contributors to their own encounter with the message of the Gospel. In essence, this is apparently what Paul did through his cross-cultural mission, as he placed importance and value on communicating the Gospel, not limited by but rather enabled through his creative use of the Scriptures and concepts of Israel. Hence, Scripture translation affirms and revitalizes the importance of mother-tongue hermeneutics. If it can be shown that Paul was able to mediate the concepts (and not only texts) of his *Ioudaios* context then Scripture translation and interpretation in Africa has a paradigm to consider and possibly, even to emulate. This is important for Christianity and theological praxis in Africa.

2.7 Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to situate Paul within his *Ioudaios* identity or within the Judean ethnocultural heritage of his time. Whilst recognizing the complexity of such a position, it remains important to affirm that Paul, as far as is reflected in his writings, did not in any manner defect from his *Ioudaios* identity. This was reflected in his identity and it can also be recognized in his use of *Ioudaios* concepts as he wrote to the Jesus-followers in the specific case of 1 Corinthians. Translation studies can contribute to draw from this area of Pauline studies that is yet to be fully tapped (see Ciampa, 2012a: 293–318). The value of Paul's *Ioudaios* identity as a translator-interpreter of the Scriptures of Israel and for that matter, the texts he produced, for making sense of the Bible in contemporary Africa cannot be underestimated. Many of the discussions on Paul's appropriation of the Scriptures of Israel have dwelt on the standpoint of texts (sources), hermeneutics and theology. This research seeks to make a case for the need to re-evaluate these issues from his *Ioudaios* identity, concepts and linguistic or literary approach within a cross-cultural-rhetoric milieu.

The next chapter will focus on the setting and multifaceted-ethnocultural milieu of the first century CE believers in Corinth.

CHAPTER 3

3.0 Paul's Roman Corinth: A Study in Historical-Critical and Literary-Rhetorical Analysis³⁴

3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter we identified Paul's *Ioudaios* identity and subsequently discussed the impact of such a perspective on understanding his mission-task as a translator-interpreter. This chapter approaches the issue from the angle of his audience in Roman Corinth. The following questions become relevant: How multifaceted was Paul's audience? What were the literary, social and ethnocultural markers that defined the community of believers Paul established in Corinth? When Paul's use of Scripture is discussed, where can one position his audience and how could an understanding of Paul's audience (especially from his perspective) facilitate an insight into the rhetorical purpose of Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel and *Ioudaios* conceptualizations? This chapter seeks to discuss these and other relevant issues of ethnicity and identity related to Paul's Roman Corinthian audience and subsequently, his own identity. There is at least some probability that Paul's literary approach was influenced by the context within which he had to send this and other letters.

³⁴ Mark Allan Powell explains historical criticism as a term "used in New Testament studies as an umbrella term for those approaches that focus on the circumstances of a text's composition (e.g., source criticism, form criticism, redaction criticism...)" (2009: 55), and literary criticism as a term "which encompasses approaches that focus on interpretation of the text that is now before us (e.g., narrative criticism, rhetorical criticism, reader-response criticism, ideological criticism...)" (Powell, 2009: 55). Craig L. Blomberg also discussed these two methodologies in his book: *A Handbook of New Testament Exegesis* (see Blomberg, 2010: 63–115).

In this chapter (but more broadly in this entire research), I apply literary-rhetorical analysis (aligning with many scholars identified below) as a viable tool for discerning the situation of a letter. Keeping in mind that no method of exegetical analysis is perfect, I begin with a critique of the more popular historical-critical method, then shift emphasis to the use of the literary-rhetorical method to establish a case for Paul's implied audience and their identity circumscribed in the letter.

3.2 Paul's Roman Corinth: Historical-Critical and Archaeological Discussion

The Corinth in which Paul ministered, and those to whom he addressed letters established house-gatherings of believers was a resettled Roman colony (see Sanders, 2005: 22).³⁵ Prior to its annexation, Corinth had served as a prominent Hellenistic city known for its rich ethnocultural and commercial activities (McRay, 2000: 228; see Green, 2013: 550). It is therefore common for scholars to speak of Corinth as a Hellenistic city prior to its Roman destruction and Corinth as a Roman colony or similarly, Roman Corinth, which it became under Roman political rule in New Testament times. Nonetheless, Roman Corinth still manifested certain levels of its Hellenism (see Green, 2013: 551–552). In some sense there was a subtly tense coexistence of both the Roman and Hellenistic socio-cultural ethos (McRay, 2000: 230; see Bookidis, 2005: 151–152, 164).³⁶

Roman Corinth was resettled, among other groups, with “the freedmen, *phlebs* (‘commoners’), and veterans of the Roman legions” (Green, 2013: 550, italics in original; compare also, Bookidis, 2005: 151). Anthony C. Thiselton has expanded the second group as comprising “urban trades persons and laborers” (Thiselton, 2000: 3). Scholarly consensus is that other groups such as Judeans, for example, moved into Roman Corinth (Wiseman, 1979:

³⁵ G.D.R. Sanders narrates the following: “In 146 B.C.E., after defeating the Achaian League led by the Corinthians at Lefkopetros on the Isthmus, the Roman general Mummius sacked Corinth. He killed the male population and sold the women and children into slavery. Thereafter Corinth was no longer a political entity but at least an almost-deserted ghost town occupied by a small non-Corinthian population engaged in cultivation of the agricultural land... The city was refounded in 44 B.C.E. by Julius Caesar as a colony for 16,000 colonists. Its territory was measured out into portions for the colonists and the city was redeveloped on an orthogonal plan” (Sanders, 2005: 22, see also full article, : 11–24).

³⁶ J.R. McRay observes: “The extent to which the rebuilt Greek city of Corinth had become Roman, after the commissioning of the colony in 44 B.C., is seen in the fact that after this date Latin predominated its inscriptions. Of 104 inscriptions prior to the reign of Hadrian in the early second century, 101 are in Latin and only 3 in Greek... The structure and administration of Corinth was Roman, but Paul wrote to the church there in Greek, which indicates that the unofficial language was still Greek. By the time of Hadrian and the visit of Pausanias, Greek had established itself once again as the official language. Corinth was a Roman colony, like Philippi, and exhibited evidence of its Roman base through these Latin inscriptions. Eight of the surviving seventeen names of Corinthian Christians are Latin: Aquila (Acts 18:1), Fortunatus (1 Cor 16:17), Gaius (Rom 16:23), Lucius (Rom 16:21), Priscilla (Acts 18:1, or Prisca, Rom 16:3), Quartus (Rom 16:23), Tertius (Rom 16:22) and Titius Justus (Acts 18:7). The other names are Greek: Achaicus (1 Cor 16:17), Erastus (Acts 19:22; Rom 16:23; 2 Tim 4:20), Jason (Acts 17:5, 6, 7, 9; Rom 16:21), Crispus (Acts 18:8; 1 Cor 1:14), Phoebe (Rom 16:1), Sosipater (Rom 16:21), Sosthenes (Acts 18:17; 1 Cor 1:1), Stephanas (1 Cor 1:16; 16:15, 17) and Chloe (1 Cor 1:11)” (McRay, 2000: 230).

497; McRay, 2000: 230; Thiselton, 2000: 4–5; see Green, 2013: 151).³⁷ Nancy Bookidis (2005) has hinted at the possibility that the city may not have been completely abandoned during the period prior to the 44 B.C.E. resettlement (see Bookidis, 2005: 148–149, 150, 164), and this is possible because, after the Mummius-led destruction, “much of Greek Corinth may still have been standing in some form or other. Certainly, no evidence of destruction was found in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore” (2005: 151).³⁸

Post 44 BCE, as a typical Roman colony, Corinth went through changes, architecturally and civic-wise (political and society), reshaping and remodelling the city into a “proper” resemblance of Rome (see Bookidis, 2005: 152; Green, 2013: 552). Most of these changes were championed by various Emperors (see Bookidis, 2005: 164). This re-modeling or restructuring was aimed at transforming urban Corinth from its Hellenistic or Greek-dominated socio-cultural ethos to a Roman-befitting one. Therefore, from Latin being made the official language in the early first century BCE and CE to the cultic adaptations (pantheon of Roman gods versus Greek gods) and competition between the imperial games and the Isthmian games (see Bookidis, 2005: 152–153; Robinson, 2005: 116), such socio-political reconstruction made certain that Roman Corinth was a city set on a scale of socio-cultural balance and cultic power maneuvering.

In the third edition of his groundbreaking work, *St. Paul’s Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*, Jerome Murphy-O’Connor (2002), dedicates the first part (Part 1) to a compendium of portions of classical works by Ancient Greek and Latin writers whose works directly or

³⁷ J.R. McRay has shared that: “Corinth contained a sizable Jewish population. There were Jews in Corinth as early as the reign of Caligula (A.D. 37-41; Philo *Leg. Gai.* 281), and others came during the expulsion of Jews from Rome under Claudius (Acts 18:2; Suetonius *Claudius* 25.4; Orosius *Hist.* 7.6.15). Jewish inscriptions have appeared in the recent publication of inscriptions that were found piecemeal in the area of Corinth from 1951 to 1976” (2000: 230 italics in original).

³⁸ See also Wiseman who observes that: “The destruction of Corinth was far less extensive than scholars have preferred to believe. Few of the buildings excavated, in fact, can be shown to have been subjected to the great violence that has customarily been associated with the plundering of Corinth in 146 B.C.” (Wiseman, 1979: 494).

indirectly pertain to Corinth through its Hellenistic and Roman epochs. These works, about thirty-three in all, with overlapping accounts, include Pausanias' *Description of Greece* and Strabo's *Geography* (see Murphy-O'Connor, 2002: 5–39; 52–69, respectively). Pausanias and Strabo's classical works are more relevant to this research as, primarily, unlike the others, they present more thorough and closer historical, geographical, cult-life and socio-political accounts of Corinth (both Hellenistic and Roman features) through the epochs they each cover. Yet, regarding these classical works, it may be necessary to note the cautionary words by John R. Lanci (2005) who warns against an uncritical general acceptance of the historical accuracy of ancient authors' works although they nevertheless provide a general sense of the prevailing circumstances in Corinth.³⁹

3.3 Cult-life, Culture and Social Ethos of Paul's Roman Corinth

Nancy Bookidis' (2005) article on "Religion in Corinth: 146 B.C.E to 100 C.E" discusses the theme of religion from the predominantly Hellenistic era of the city to its post-destruction and establishment as Roman Corinth (see Bookidis, 2005: 141–164). While acknowledging the limitations of her findings,⁴⁰ she is able to demonstrate that as a Hellenistic city, Corinth was a centre of cultic renown. The plethora of cults and shrines she references (see Bookidis, 2005: 148) are evidence to this fact. The transition from a Hellenistic to a Roman city as a

³⁹ In his estimation, "ancient texts must be read in their context and with attention to their genre and purpose. In other words, they must be read critically... few of us would uncritically cite a religious text to support a historical argument. But why do so many historians, archaeologists, and scholars of religion check their critical faculties at the door when they read Strabo? Or Pausanias? Or Athenaeus? ...They are rhetorical texts; they are making arguments—about Corinth (often in relation to Athens), or about what it is to be a Greek or a barbarian. Oftentimes, the authors are engaged in boundary formation and cultural self-definition" (Lanci, 2005: 214–215).

⁴⁰ Concerning her discussion on the cult of Hellenistic Corinth, Bookidis (2005) notes that "One must remember that available sources are extremely fragmentary and uneven... Written evidence is limited to that contained in brief literary sources and the all-too-few inscriptions, which include part of an archaic ritual calendar" (2005: 142). Again, on the cults of Roman Corinth she expresses the same difficulty as follows: "First, as with Hellenistic Corinth, both literary and epigraphical resources for the Roman period are few, and the inscriptions are quite fragmentary" (2005: 151).

result of the Mummian destruction seems to have had little or no effect on the cultic life of Corinth. In her view, “much of Greek Corinth may still have been standing in some form or other. Certainly, no evidence of destruction was found in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore” (2005: 151). Her survey of Roman Corinth and its cultic life reveal how the Romans established Corinth as a cultic or religious colony through the establishment of Roman-identified deities and yet also, the “syncretization” of these alongside Hellenistic deities (see Bookidis, 2005: 151–161). Her concluding thoughts are worth noting:

I recognize three different simultaneous levels in the operation of religion in Early Roman Corinth. The first is that of the official Roman cults of the mother city, which were chiefly gathered in the forum. These drew their inspiration, in large measure, from the house of Augustus and possibly Marc Anthony. The second level is that of cults, like those of Apollo, Aphrodite, Asklepios, and Demeter and Kore, that had Greek roots in the city but were by the first century C.E. a part of Roman civic religion. Reinstated in their original places, they were organized according to the needs and customs of the new practitioners. The third level is that of the fringe Greek cults (Bookidis, 2005: 163).

Ben Witherington III has also summed up the situation with these thoughts: “Romans in general adopted and incorporated Greek gods and goddesses into their own religious practices, and apart from sometimes changing the names of the deities, they often did not significantly modify what they took over” (1995: 13). These facts give an indication of an already complex cultic system at play in Roman Corinth. Hafemann observes that “by Paul’s day Corinth had thus become a pluralistic melting pot of cultures, philosophies, lifestyles and religions, and had the feel of an economic ‘boom-town’” (1993: 173). One can argue that, Roman Corinth therefore, remained both ancient and modern in its cult-life and cultural expressions (see Bookidis, 2005: 164). Furthermore, the social, cultic and cultural ethos of the city was reinforced strongly by its representation as an imperial or senatorial province and being made the capital city of the Achaian region (see Hafemann, 1993: 172; Witherington III, 1995: 9). All these and others indeed signified the multifaceted context within which Paul

had to engage with the Scriptures of Israel, *Ioudaios* concepts and expressions as he wrote to the community of Jesus-followers in Corinth.

With this backdrop, subsequent sections below will begin to focus on Paul's community(-ies) of Jesus-followers in Roman Corinth and explore contemporary scholarly discussions related to this research.

3.4 Paul's 1 Corinthians Correspondence: A Literary-Rhetorical Analysis of the Situation, Context and Identity of his Audience

So far, the discussion in this chapter has taken a historical-critical approach⁴¹ to survey the general historical situation that pertained before and during Paul's Roman Corinth. As a micro-niche within the broad Roman Corinth context, it is important to look at the unique situation of the audiences Paul addressed in the letter under study. With respect to the caption and objective of this section, the issue of identity, even though captioned above, will be discussed in the next sections.

Scores of scholarly works have been produced concerning the situation of the audience of Paul's canonically first letter to the gatherings of Jesus-followers in the city of Corinth. Those who have followed historical-critical approaches as well as archaeological findings to discuss the situation of the community(ies) of believers in Corinth include scholars such as Jerome Murphy-O'Connor (2002), Justin J. Meggitt (1998), Gerd Theissen (1982), David G. Horrell (2004) and many more. As I have indicated from the beginning of the research (see Chapter 1), the primary methodology on which the discussions, analysis and results of this work would centre is a literary-rhetorical methodology. So far, I have engaged with works depending primarily on the historical-critical approaches for discussing Paul and his Roman-

⁴¹ Refer to footnote 34, of this chapter, for a brief explanation on this methodology.

Corinth 1st Century C.E. audiences. Despite its strengths as a methodology which has reigned since the 16th century Protestant Reformation and escalating into the 18th century Enlightenment era, it has been heavily critiqued as inadequate by scholars such as Segovia (1995a,b) who finds that “the world of biblical criticism today is very different from that of the mid-70s... the field has undergone a fundamental and radical shift of such magnitude and consequences that it cannot be reasonably compared to any other in the century...its impact has only just begun” (Segovia, 1995b: 1).⁴²

In a sense, the framework of this research has also been a comparative outlook at these two major methodologies. Although my focal analysis lies with the literary-rhetorical approaches, each chapter so far has demonstrated what both methodologies can bring to the fore concerning Paul’s ethnocultural identity and his use of the Scriptures of Israel.

For mapping out a probable context and historical reconstruction of the situation of Paul’s audience in Roman Corinth, a literary method known as Rhetorical Criticism can be a helpful tool (see Pogoloff, 1992: 79–95).⁴³ Even though Christopher D. Stanley asserts that it is not possible to construct Paul’s audience through solely a literary analysis approach (see 1999: 143), contrary to his view, some scholars⁴⁴ have shown that it is possible to do so. George A.

⁴² I can also add the critique on the historical approaches from a paragraph of W. Randolph Tate’s (2008) work: “Several points argue against the purely historical approach and its locus of meaning. First, there is an inevitable gap between the originating moment in the author’s mind and the cultural specificity of the author’s language. In other words, can there ever be a complete guarantee that the author has successfully transferred authorial intention to the written page? Is the text a foolproof and undistorted mirror of the author’s mind? ...Second, with the inordinate amount of attention given to the world behind the text, the text itself has suffered from too little attention. Historical criticism has relentlessly sought to focus its illuminating searchlight upon the world behind the text, the real historical world within which a work of literature was given birth. The understanding (i.e., an understanding with any degree of plausibility) of the literary work hinges precariously upon a reconstruction of the work’s historical milieu. It should be clear that the historical approach must ultimately lead to a view of the text as an artifact that can and must be understood by using the scientific tools of anthropology, archeology and linguistics just as one would employ for any artifact. But due to the historical method’s exclusive focus on the world behind the text, the world within the text has been unduly neglected” (2008: 3) (see also Yee, 1995; 2008: 3).

⁴³ Pogoloff (1992) makes a good argument for constructing the historical situation of 1 Corinthians 1-4 from a rhetorical critical perspective.

⁴⁴ See works by S.M. Pogoloff (1992), M.M. Mitchell (1991), Ben Witherington III (1995) and Richard A. Horsley (2005).

Kennedy's (1984) groundbreaking work on the New Testament and Rhetorical Criticism is worth mentioning as a typical example. On methodology, "two different basic approaches characterize rhetorical criticism of the NT" (Heil, 2005: 4). These are, firstly, "a more historical-critical approach that utilizes the categories and devices of ancient classical Greco-Roman rhetoric" (Heil, 2005: 4) and secondly, "a more literary-critical approach that utilizes modern scientific theories, sometimes called 'New Rhetoric,' to analyze texts" (Heil, 2005: 4). Both approaches are crucial to this study, but, the latter would be employed largely in discussions in Chapters 4 and 5. Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, for example, has made a case for such a historical reconstruction from a rhetorical critical approach of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians (see 1987: 386–403). She expressed her objective in the following words: "I would like to investigate whether a critical rhetorical interpretation of 1 Corinthians is able not only to say something about the rhetorical techniques and narrative strategies of Paul's letter to the community in Corinth, but also about the actual rhetorical historical situation to which the letter is addressed" (Schüssler Fiorenza, 1987: 387). It is by this task of determining the "actual rhetorical historical situation to which the letter is addressed" (Schüssler Fiorenza, 1987:387) that these proceeding sections seek to complement the archaeological and ancient history sections previously addressed above. The definition of the term "rhetorical situation," its composition and legitimate appropriation in literary-rhetorical criticism, as used by Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and others, has already been explored by Lloyd F. Bitzer (1968).⁴⁵ In agreement with scholars like George A. Kennedy (1984), Schüssler Fiorenza proposes that the letter falls into the category of a deliberative rhetoric with some portions exhibiting judicial rhetoric (see 1987: 393). Margaret M. Mitchell (1991)

⁴⁵ Lloyd F. Bitzer (1968) has defined rhetorical situation "as a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence" (1968: 6). In the case of Paul and the community of believers in Roman Corinth, the above definition clearly shows the presence of a rhetorical situation (not merely a historical one).

and Stephen Pogoloff (1992) agree with the description of 1 Corinthians as deliberative rhetoric.

Witherington III follows the same tradition with some minor changes: “1 Corinthians is deliberative rhetoric, but there is a semi-forensic cast to ch. 9 and an epideictic character to ch. 13, both of which are ‘digressions’ from the main trajectory of the argument, though they have direct relevance for the larger argument” (1995: 46). In the second chapter of Mitchell’s work, she attempts to establish proof of evidence for regarding 1 Corinthians as deliberative rhetoric (see Mitchell, 1991: 20–64). She discusses four proofs that indicate that “the rhetorical species of the argument in this letter is deliberative” (1991: 60). Placing 1 Corinthians in a deliberative rhetorical frame influences or shapes the lens with which the letter’s rhetorical situation is viewed. The interpretation of Paul’s words is also influenced as a result of describing the rhetoric as deliberative. This same principle applies to scholars who place the entire letter in different rhetorical settings such as either judicial or epideictic.⁴⁶ Schüssler Fiorenza’s assessment of the rhetorical situation of Paul’s audience displays a more complex situation than has been assumed in some scholarly works (see Schüssler Fiorenza, 1987: 397–400). She disagrees with the opinion that the letter has an epideictic or forensic (that is judicial) rhetoric and raises as a query the concern that attention must be paid to the reason Paul begins his response to the issues raised by the community(-ies) from Chapter 7 and rather begins Chapters 1-4 as an appeal for unity. She also refutes the assumption that Chloe’s household presents an oral report to Paul, whilst Stephanas leading his household gives Paul a more official written report (see Schüssler Fiorenza, 1987: 393–396). Schüssler Fiorenza’s proposal of the rhetorical situation is partly a support of the views suggested by Nils Dahl (1977). To paraphrase, she proposes that the tension in Corinth had not yet evolved into factions (they were mere debates and differing opinions) and as such, Paul is thought to

⁴⁶ See Schüssler Fiorenza (1987: 391–393) who reviews the rhetorical situation of 1 Corinthians as has been identified by scholars such as W. Wuellner (1979) who places the letter in an epideictic rhetorical setting.

have handled the matter with foresight inhibiting future outcomes of factions (see Schüssler Fiorenza, 1987: 396).⁴⁷ It is based on this premise that she argues that “Paul does not defend his authority as an apostle among other apostles but rather, argues for his authority as the *sole* founder and father of the Corinthian community” (1987: 397, italics in original). Further, “Paul establishes a line of authority God, Christ, Paul, Apollos, Timothy, Stephanas, and other local co-workers to which the Corinthians should subordinate themselves because they are ‘Christ’s’” (1987: 397). For her response to the all-important question; to whom is Paul’s rhetoric of appeal directed in the Corinthian audience? she decides, based on the premises that the rhetorical form of the letter is deliberative, that “Paul appeals to those who, like himself, were of higher social and educational status. They should make the ecclesial decisions which are, in his opinion, necessary in Corinth” (Schüssler Fiorenza, 1987: 399). This view is also supported by Pogoloff (1992) who holds that “Paul aims much of his rhetoric at the higher status Corinthians, but it is not to convict them, but to alter their attitudes and behaviors” (1992: 90).

The literary-rhetorical methodology highlights the complexity and multifaceted audience that Paul had to address. However, unlike the historical-critical methodologies, the literary-rhetorical critical approach is able to throw further light on how Paul maneuvers his rhetoric, on the literary techniques and the role of his own personality and that of his audience in creating the effectiveness of his communication. Another example of the limitations of the historical-critical approaches when used in reconstructing ancient audiences can be observed through the discussion in Caroline Johnson Hodge’s (2007) work. In the introductory parts of her book, she categorizes two types of recipients or audiences (but at other times she refers to

⁴⁷ According to Schüssler Fiorenza, “although the literature extensively debates whether there were four, three, or only two factions in Corinth, it usually overlooks that the information of Chloe’s followers about ἐριδες (PI.) that is, that debates, discussions, or competing claims among them are reinterpreted by Paul (λέγω δὲ τοῦτο) as party-strife. It is Paul, and not the Corinthians, who understands their debates as party or school divisions” (1987: 396).

them as readers): the encoded reader and the empirical reader (see Johnson Hodge, 2007: 10). She explains that: “the historical-reconstruction approach involves two steps. First, it reconstructs a particular empirical audience, the historical community of Christ believers in Rome in the mid-first century, as a mix of *Ioudaioi* and *ethnē* in Christ. This process is necessarily speculative because of the sparseness of the evidence” (2007: 10, italics in original). Unfortunately, “second, it treats this reconstructed empirical audience as the audience assumed in the letters, effectively collapsing the empirical and encoded audiences into one” (2007: 10). She states conclusively that: “while the historical-reconstruction approach speculatively links ethnic labels to empirical readers, a text-based interpretation (such as a literary-rhetorical approach) identifies the ways that ethnic language is working rhetorically in the text” (2007: 11, words in brackets mine). Nonetheless, this does not in any way set the two methodologies against each other.⁴⁸ Schüssler Fiorenza (1987) has endeavoured to make a case for the kind of synergy that must exist between the two methodologies; Pogoloff (1992) paraphrases this as follows: “Rhetorical situation, then, allows us to ‘move from the ‘world of the text’ of Paul to the ... world of the Corinthian community’ without ever leaving the world of the reader” (see Schüssler Fiorenza, 1987: 388; 1992: 83, ellipsis in original). In a reconstruction from the letter of the rhetorical situation of Paul’s audience, therefore, “neither the implied author nor reader is a fiction divorced from the actual author or reader. They are distinguished from the actual writer and reader not by a dichotomy of fact and fiction, but by the phenomenology of writing and reading” (Pogoloff, 1992: 80; see also, Bitzer, 1968: 11). Inevitably, during Scripture translation, the translator’s knowledge of the historical background of the literary work being translated is emphasized as very important. Considering the literary nature of translation

⁴⁸ Pogoloff (1992) drawing from Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (1987) makes the case that “rhetorical criticism’s concept of the rhetorical situation can integrate the historical, literary, hermeneutical/pastoral, and social world approaches” (1992: 71).

studies and work, my conviction is that, it should become imperative that the rhetorical situation within the text itself becomes a primary point of concern for such a historical reconstruction. A strong case can be made in this respect, that translators need to be primarily and more acquainted with the rhetorical situations of the texts or books being translated and then, supplement this with the information gathered from the historical background where necessary.

The rhetorical situation of Paul's implied audience is as much shaped by an issue of identity formation as it is by Paul's cross-cultural mission and message. The next important issue for discussion is the matter of identity as related to Paul's implied audience in Roman Corinth.

3.5 Audiences in Antiquity and Paul's Corinthian Audience: Christopher D. Stanley versus Brian J. Abasciano

In his article titled "‘Pearls before Swine’: Did Paul's Audiences Understand His Biblical Quotations?" Christopher D. Stanley (1999) opens his crucial discussion on the literary context of Paul's first century audiences. His work, however, has been heavily critiqued by Brian J. Abasciano in his rebuttal titled "Diamonds in the Rough: A Reply to Christopher Stanley concerning the Reader Competency of Paul's Original Audiences" (see Abasciano, 2007: 153–183). Taking these two studies as point of departure, can shed some further light on how to go about Paul's Corinthian audience. Stanley's article takes a skeptical approach to granting Paul's audience any glimpse of literary competence and makes several assumptions which for the purposes of this chapter includes: that Paul's first century audience could not have "recognized and appreciated his many unmarked references to the biblical text" (1999: 132) with special reference to Paul's allusions and echoes; and, that the limited literacy during Paul's first century could have played against his goal of communicating with his

audiences.⁴⁹ There is also an overriding sense that Stanley constantly surmises that Paul's use of Scripture in no way considered his Gentile audience. To Stanley, Paul's Gentile audience is illiterate with respect to the Scriptures of Israel and Paul himself was not concerned about their reception of his rhetorical use of Scripture (see Stanley, 1999: 134–135).⁵⁰ Stanley accuses Paul, as a writer, of general misappropriation or misquotation and misinterpretation of Scripture in his letters (see Stanley, 1999: 136–137) and concludes that Paul's only rhetorical purpose for his use of Scripture was primarily to stamp his authority and put his audience into submission without much regard for the contexts of the texts he used (see Stanley, 1999: 134 & 141).

To a large extent, Stanley considers it rhetorically ineffective and a waste of effort for Paul to have engaged the Scriptures of Israel in his correspondence with his communities of Jesus-followers. He bases this conclusion on the predominantly Gentile composition of Paul's audiences, whom he assumes were ignorant of the technicality of the Scriptures of Israel and how Paul used them. But since, inevitably, Paul's letters, as we have them today, do contain various forms of references to these Scriptures, Stanley alludes to "implied readers"⁵¹ audience identity for Paul's first century audience as fiction. These "implied readers", he explains, "tell us little or nothing about the actual first-century recipients of the text" (1999:

⁴⁹ Stanley (1999) draws references from William Harris and Harry Gamble. On the former he writes: "William Harris concluded that not more than 10 to 20% of the populace would have been able to read or write at any level throughout the classical, Hellenistic, and Roman imperial periods" and of the latter he writes: "Harry Gamble concluded that even if the early church had a disproportionate number of craftspeople and small business workers among its numbers, the literacy level in the earliest churches would still not have exceeded the upper end of the range specified by Harris" (1999: 129). It is needful to mention as well that Stanley (1999) lays the weight of the low literacy argument against the Gentile members of Paul's audience whom he suspects would not have benefitted much from his rhetoric as far as his use of Scripture was concerned (see Stanley, 1999: 130).

⁵⁰ This research seeks to refute that opinion. Succinctly, Paul's use of Jewish Scriptures was crafted creatively with 'translation' and re-interpretation cues targeted at the understanding of his Gentile audience as well. The next section in this chapter discusses this matter.

⁵¹ For Paul's audience, Stanley (1999) explains that "the 'implied readers' are Christians who are (a) broadly familiar with the Greek text of the Jewish Scriptures, (b) able to recognize immediately how specific quotations fit into the developing argument of his letter, and (c) willing to accept his quotations as valid renderings of the authoritative text" (1999: 143).

143). And he asserts that “how well these “implied readers” correspond to any “original audience” of the text must be determined through careful historical study, not literary analysis” (1999: 143).⁵² We might deduce from his arguments that Stanley implicitly acknowledges the complexity and breadth of Paul’s use of Scripture, his depth of interpretation and so he finds it quite impossible to assume or accept, reading from his audience-centred approach, that any implied audience in the first century could have comprehended and grasped the communicative effect of the contents of the letters nor their creative use of the Scriptures of Israel. Also, his skepticism of literary analysis for rendering historically-verifiable results, and his attitude towards historical critical approaches may deserve some more critical review.⁵³ In my view, a more integrative and critical understanding or perspective is expressed in the words of Pogoloff: “we can no longer take a simple approach to historical reconstruction, as if we were somehow exempt from the subjectivity of sociolinguistic worlds, or as if the meaning of a text lies *only* in the ashes of the past” (1992: 71, emphasis mine). Rather, and more progressively, “these challenges to historical criticism do not mean we must turn away from history. Instead, rhetorical criticism offers a paradigm for integrating the various interpretive strategies which now sometimes compete” (Pogoloff, 1992: 71).

As indicated above, Abasciano (2007) attempts to deconstruct Stanley’s assumptions. Specifically, on the matter of literacy in the first century C.E. Greco-Roman world and Paul’s

⁵² Nonetheless, for Stanley (1999), “it seems highly unlikely that many members of Paul’s first-century churches would have matched the profile of the ‘implied readers’ of Paul’s quotations” (1999: 144).

⁵³ Placing Stanley’s assertions about the fictiveness of Paul’s implied audience side-by-side with Bitzer’s (1968) study of what makes a rhetorical discourse and situation shows difficulties in accepting Stanley’s assumptions. Bitzer has explained that: “The exigence and the complex of persons, objects, events and relations which generate rhetorical discourse are located in reality, are objective and publicly observable historic facts in the world we experience, are therefore available for scrutiny by an observer or critic who attends to them. To say the situation is objective, publicly observable, and historic means that it is real or genuine – that our critical examination will certify its existence.” (Bitzer, 1968: 11). Based on this, it is conclusive, that: “the rhetorical situation as real is to be distinguished also from a fictive rhetorical situation” (Bitzer, 1968: 11). Paul’s letter was a response to a real situation (and not a fictive one) and a real audience (even if implied). His rhetoric with all its devices must, therefore, be situated in this reality.

own communities, Abasciano concedes that indeed “most of the members of Paul’s original audiences would not have been able to read the Scriptures (or Paul’s letters) individually for themselves” (Abasciano, 2007: 165). Nonetheless, he disagrees when Stanley “infers that this would mean that the vast majority of the members of Paul’s audiences were scripturally ignorant and unable to assess his use of the biblical text” (2007: 165). By way of comparison, I draw on Gillian Clark, who has remarked that “a literacy rate approaching 10 percent is shockingly low by modern standards, but it is still a lot of people who can read” (2004: 81). The focal point that Abasciano seeks to remind Stanley is the fact that, in first century C.E. Greco-Roman world “literacy and orality interpenetrated one another” (2007: 165). At the mention of orality, it should be borne in mind that first century communities were primarily audiences, and not readers. Even though literary materials (scrolls, papyrus, stylus, ink and so on) were expensive, as far as the Scriptures of Israel were concerned, the presence of synagogues was sufficient to provide such avenues, even for Gentiles, to hear and engage with these texts orally. Certainly, Stanley’s argument of high illiteracy inhibiting access to Scriptures is not an accurate corollary to establish. Harry Gamble also makes the following assessment: “Christianity’s concern with texts was practical and functional rather than literary in the high sense: texts served the needs of communication, teaching, evangelism, apologetics and worship. Not least in connection with worship a small fund of texts would have been indispensable in virtually every Christian community. Although the vast majority of Christians were, like the larger society, illiterate, through the public reading, interpretation and exposition of texts in worship and catechesis they were strongly exposed to texts and participated in book culture to an unusual degree” (Gamble, 2000: 646, see further discussion : 644–648). Access to and ability to understand literary materials on a community-based level was much possible and active in Paul’s first century communities (see Gamble, 2000: 647).⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Gamble (2000) further noted that: “Reading in antiquity was customarily done aloud, even if privately. The

A subsection of Stanley's case for high illiteracy among Paul's communities of Jesus-followers narrows down to the Gentile composition and he makes this assertion with specific reference to their ignorance of the Scriptures of Israel, which Paul quotes extensively as in the typical case of the letter to the Romans (see Stanley, 1999: 130–135). This assumption is also refuted by Abasciano in his reply to Stanley based on, among other proofs, evidence from Luke's account in Acts concerning Gentile God-fearers having some form of exposure to the Scriptures and Judean traditions through avenues such as the synagogue system (see Abasciano, 2007: 167–173). Stanley launches a double-edged attack in this respect as he applies the above assertion on Paul's literary identity as well. He assumes that Paul shows a heavy influence of the LXX in his Scripture use and hence, it fails to prove that he had any knowledge of or studied the text in Hebrew (see Stanley, 1999: 136).⁵⁵ Stanley presumes that Paul used the LXX not because of his Greek or Hellenistic audience but because of his own inability or lack of proficiency with Hebrew texts (see Stanley, 1999: 136–137).⁵⁶ In this research, by positing Paul's role and self-identity as a translator-interpreter (see discussion in Chapter 2) to his community of Jesus-followers, it shall be shown that Paul's use of Scripture (whether directly from the LXX, Hebrew Masoretic Text or any *Vorlage*) featured levels of his own critical renditions and adaptation of words and concepts with his multifaceted audience (*Ioudaios*, Hellenists or Roman) in mind (see also Heil, 2005: 4–5).⁵⁷ For the issue

reason is that texts were written in continuous script...without divisions between words, phrases, clauses or paragraphs, and without punctuation, so that the syllables needed to be sounded and heard in order to be organized into recognizable semantic patterns. Correspondingly, almost all ancient texts were composed in consideration of how they would sound when read than to read it oneself. There were various occasions of public reading when the illiterate or semiliterate might hear a text and have contact with literary culture" (2000: 647).

⁵⁵ This matter of Paul's *Ioudaios* background and knowledge of the Scriptures of Israel in Hebrew has been discussed extensively in Chapter 2 of this work.

⁵⁶ For C.D. Stanley (1999), the Hebrew text represents the original context of the texts and Paul's lack of study in it automatically places a majority of his quotations out of context.

⁵⁷ John Paul Heil (2005) has expressed the following opinion: "Although Greco-Roman rhetoric influenced Paul, whether directly or indirectly, he employed, adapted, and transformed it in his own way and for his own purposes. But we must keep in mind that Paul also utilized distinctively Jewish rhetorical devices and techniques in his Septuagintal use of the Old Testament... Paul's use and adaptation of Jewish exegetical

of Paul's out-of-context use of Scripture, one can refer to Abasciano's apt reply which will not be discussed here (see Abasciano, 2007: 173–177). It must be granted Stanley, at least, that no communication is 100% effective (amidst all kinds of challenges) and he is right, in part, to assert that “we should be careful therefore about assuming that he [*Paul*] expected his audience to grasp all or even the majority of his biblical references” (Stanley, 1999: 135, word in italics mine). Nonetheless, such a concession does not warrant the conclusions he draws (see Stanley, 1999: 134–136) for assessing the reader-competency of Paul's audience or Paul's own proficiency and rhetorical integrity as a communicator of the Gospel message.

The conclusion here is that, Paul's audience as a community (not necessarily as individuals) of house-gatherings of Jesus-followers were able to assess and assimilate Paul's writing (not necessarily 100%) and it is with this view in mind, that Paul deploys all available rhetorical devices, including quoting the Scriptures of Israel, its concepts and expressions.

3.6 Channeling or Translating Israel – Communicating to Corinthians: Paul's Literary-Rhetorical Identity

In the previous section, we have established the literary or implied audience identity of Paul's community(ies). Most importantly, we have established the fact that this implied audience identity is not fictitious, it has everything to do with the rhetorical situation of the text. It has also been established that Paul's Roman Corinthian Jesus-followers were a multi-cultural and social group of house-gatherings. Again, it is affirmed that the letter was aimed at achieving concord and avoiding factions, both present or future (see Mitchell, 1991).

Two important issues, then, arise that need to be addressed as they tie in with the objective of this research. The first has to do with the issue of rhetorical identity and the implications of

techniques, such as *gezera shava*, *kal va-homer*, peshet, and targumic methods have not only interpretive but rhetorical functions” (2005: 4–5).

how Paul weaves his rhetorical tools vis-à-vis the Scriptures of Israel and concepts to achieve his goal. The second, which is a consequence of the first, is then ascertaining how these issues impact Paul's own identity formation both rhetorically and ethnoculturally as *Ioudaios* (discussed in Chapter 2). Subsequently, what justification or explanation is there to clarify the assertion that Paul negotiated all these roads in his communication without compromising his convictions or ethnocultural identity as an Israelite, a bearer of the Gospel message and the truth of the message itself?

Beginning with the first issue, it is relevant that among the many literary-rhetorical tools Paul employs, such as metaphors (see Lim, 2017),⁵⁸ there is also the terminology of ἔθνη commonly translated “gentiles” or “nations” in English versions of Scripture. In traditional theological interpretations, it has been loosely linked with expressions like “unbelievers” or “non-believers”. Concannon (2014) has raised a concern for instances when ἔθνη is made to share connotations with Christian identity (see Concannon, 2014: xi). Unfortunately, all these notions are read back into interpretation of the identity formation of Paul's first century CE audience and further, into Paul's cross-cultural gospel mission (see Concannon, 2014: xi; Johnson Hodge, 2015: 153–154). This aberration downplays Paul's rhetoric especially related to, in this case, the identity of his multifaceted and complex Roman Corinthian audience. The complexity of this fabric of identity, aimed at group unity, that Paul weaves through his rhetoric using the Scriptures of Israel and *Ioudaios* concepts or worldviews, has been discussed in scholarly works by Caroline J. Hodge (2005, 2015), Cavan Concannon (2014), M. Zetterholm (2012), William S. Campbell (2012) and Adela Y. Collins (2012). First of all, at this stage, this research takes the position that Paul's 1 Corinthians (like all his other

⁵⁸ Kar Yong Lim explores Paul's use of metaphors in the specific case of the letter to the Corinthians. He is also “interested in exploring language as a means of communication” (2017: xvi), obviously, linked with how “Paul uses various techniques and rhetoric prevalent in the Greco-Roman conventions of his day” (Lim, 2017: xvi). His final objective, which also shares a connection with this chapter, is the exploration of “the social relations of Pauline community” (Lim, 2017: xvii) and consequently, issues of social identity as related to the ἐκκλησία (see Lim, 2017: xvii).

letters) was written primarily to Gentiles (ἔθνη), notwithstanding the presence of Judean audiences in those communities (see Johnson Hodge, 2007).⁵⁹ Now concerning the ἔθνη, from the Scriptures of Israel, it is an expression used by the people of Israel to identify people outside the commonwealth of God's covenant with Abraham and the Law of Moses. Once again, Johnson Hodge (2015) explores this subject and rightly perceives that "Jewish discourses of descent and purity are Paul's resources for constructing an identity for these gentiles-in-Christ that resists classification" (2015: 154). In other words, she affirms the thesis that Paul's identity formation for his gentile audience was rooted in an *Ioudaios* conceptual eschatological worldview. Johnson Hodge (2015) has used "the holy seed ideology in Ezra and *Jubilees* to Paul, to show how Paul appropriates this language in Galatians 3"⁶⁰ and also in "1 Corinthians 6 to discuss how biblical purity language informs his crafting of gentiles as the holy members of Christ's body"⁶¹ (2015: 155, italics in original). She also holds that "each of these two lines of argument, seed of Abraham and

⁵⁹ In the introduction to her book *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*, Caroline Johnson Hodge (2007) has contributed to this discussion as follows: "Whom did Paul address in his letters? For whom does he construct his arguments? The traditional answer to this question has dominated Pauline scholarship: all people. Those in the 'timeless Paul' camp argue that he speaks to all people of all times. Others, more interested in Paul's historical context, argue that he speaks to first-century gentiles and Jews, thus all people at least in his time. There is ample evidence that Paul writes to gentiles: he sees himself as called to the gentiles (Gal 1:16, 2:7-9; Rom 11:13, 15:1-6) and addresses gentiles directly in his letters (Rom 1:5-6, 13; 11:13; 15:6). Indeed, few dispute that the gentiles were central to Paul's work and were intended as recipients of his letters. But we do not have same evidence for a Jewish audience. Indeed, Paul never claims to be speaking to *Ioudaioi* in his letters, nor does he connect his own teaching activity with *Ioudaioi*. Yet there is a pervasive and persistent assumption that Paul wrote to gentiles *and* Jews... Indeed, Paul writes about *Ioudaioi*; this does not mean he writes to them" (2007: 9–10, italics in original).

⁶⁰ On this discussion Caroline Johnson Hodge concludes as follows: "What does it mean for the status of gentiles that they are in the original seed of Abraham? This seed argument does not emphasize a pure and holy origin, either for Jews or gentiles, but an inclusive mixture, planned by God. Yet Paul does not envision a blending of the different components of this mixture; gentiles remain gentiles and Jews remain Jews, even among those who share their "in-Christness." In fact, his whole point is that it is precisely their inclusion in Abraham's seed, before the Law was given, that guarantees gentiles the benefits of the promises of God as *gentiles*, without being circumcised and keeping the Law in other ways. Their Abrahamic lineage, ironically, preserves their separation from Israel" (2015: 164, italics in original).

⁶¹ Caroline Johnson Hodge demonstrates that in 1 Corinthians 6, Paul echoes the Levitical language concerning purity on the new in-Christ status of his audience, and that like Ezra, "Paul, too, attempts to define and circumscribe the community of believers, the body of Christ, with the purity of priests" (2015: 166). These gentile bodies are now also part of Christ's *Ioudaios* body and so "filled with Christ's *pneuma* at baptism, these gentile bodies have undergone a material transformation that makes them into the Jewish body of Israel's messiah" (2015: 167, italics in original).

purity discourse, serves a different rhetorical purpose” (2015: 167). It is quite clear that as much as Paul communicated to his communities of Jesus-followers, in this case the Corinthians, he severally likened their new status in Christ to that of the Israelites in the Old Testament and this is typified, invariably, through his use of *Ioudaios* concepts or worldviews and the Scriptures of Israel. Once again, this statement does not give credence for any views of supersessionism or its reverse. Paul certainly sustains the Hellenistic, Roman and the varying ethnocultural identities of his audience. He never intends to make them Judeans in any literal or historical sense of the term. Nonetheless, he does not intend them to remain or be regarded (either by others or by themselves) as the ἔθνη, that is, a kind of “otherness” or estrangement that they have been positioned in through the use of that terminology by, especially, his (Paul’s) own people (see Johnson Hodge, 2015: 155–156). Johnson Hodge (2015), further, acknowledges that Paul seeks to set apart his audience from all “negative” affirmations of the term ἔθνη, and he goes as far as setting his “gentile” audience apart from other “gentiles” (see 2015: 156). For Johnson Hodge (2015), this process of identity formation generates an identity that she calls: “gentiles-in-Christ”. These “gentiles-in-Christ” occupy a kind of liminal space between being *those* kinds of gentiles and now *these* kinds of gentiles... Indeed, gentiles-in-Christ are not quite gentiles and not quite Jews” (2015: 157, italics in original). It is, therefore, crucial that attempts to fill this liminal space with terms like “Christians” or “proselytes” and so on, should be refuted or rejected because these terms fail to fully manifest the complexity of this identity formation (see Johnson Hodge, 2015: 172–173).⁶² There is certainly an ambiguity which Paul intentionally leaves unresolved (see Johnson Hodge, 2015: 168–169). Concannon (2014), whose work on 1 Corinthians also

⁶² In her final paragraph, she writes: “it is striking that with all of Paul’s talk of transformation and being made new (e.g., in 2 Cor. 5:17 and Gal. 6:15), he does not clearly define what gentiles have become. Scholars have long supplied ‘Christian’ to fill this void. But this misses the whole point. An exploration of how Paul portrays gentiles helps us see these letters not as founding documents of new religion, but as efforts by a faithful Jew to play his part in the larger narrative of the redemption of Israel” (Johnson Hodge, 2015: 172–173).

investigates issues of ethnicity and identity formation negotiations between Paul and his audience through his letters, terms this Paul's rhetoric of ethnicity. By exploring Paul's retelling of the Exodus narrative in 1 Corinthians 10:1-4, he points out four connections that Paul creates between "the Israelite past and the Corinthian present"⁶³ (2014: 102). He observes correctly that Paul "creates a line of continuity between the Israelite past and the Corinthian present with reference to baptism and Christ's presence among the Israelites that underscores the genealogical connection introduced by 'our fathers' in 10:1. The Corinthians are thus encouraged to see the history of the Israelites as 'their' history" (2014: 103). These observations, tied in with those by Johnson Hodge above, align with the issues this research aims to address. That is, these identity-related concerns indicate the multifaceted context of Paul's audience to whom this letter was addressed and consequently, the rhetorical depth with which Paul wrote as he employed *Ioudaios* concepts and the Scriptures of Israel in their identity formation. And it is through a focus on a literary-rhetorical analysis that such complex threads become visible.

The second issue under this section then is the question of how the discussions or assertions of Paul's identity as *Ioudaios* hold up to such a rhetoric of ethnicity among his implied audiences and their rhetorical situation (Johnson Hodge, 2005, 2015; see Concannon, 2014). In other words, it is necessary to explore how these issues of identity formation tie in with what has been asserted about Paul in Chapter 2 as *Ioudaios*. While this issue has been touched upon in Chapter 2, this section turns the discussion toward an additional aspect.⁶⁴ In

⁶³ These four connections are: "First, in 10:1 he describes the Israelites as 'our fathers,' positing a genealogical continuity between the Israelites and his Corinthian audience...Second, Paul addresses the Corinthians directly as 'siblings' (ἀδελφοί)...Third, in 10:2 Paul makes the ambiguous reference to the Israelites being baptized 'into Moses' (εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν) in the cloud and in the sea. Just as the Corinthians have been baptized into Christ (12:13), so also their forebears were baptized into Moses...A final link is created in 10:4, where the rock from which the Israelites drank (Exod 17:6; Num 20:8) is identified as Christ...the identification between Christ and the rock further connects the history of Israel with the Corinthians" (Concannon, 2014: 102–103).

⁶⁴ In Chapter 2 Paul's identity as *Ioudaios* was discussed in general but not with specific reference to how he negotiates the identity formation of his audience and also, certain specific statements he makes which

1 Corinthians 9:19-23, a chapter which follows immediately after Paul's digression on the subject of food sacrificed to idols and his use of terms such as "the weak" and "the strong" (in 1 Corinthians 8), Paul makes a series of assertions:

¹⁹ Ἐλεύθερος γὰρ ὢν ἐκ πάντων πᾶσιν ἑμαυτὸν ἐδούλωσα, ἵνα τοὺς πλείονας κερδήσω· ²⁰ καὶ ἐγενόμην τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὡς Ἰουδαῖος, ἵνα Ἰουδαίους κερδήσω· τοῖς ὑπὸ νόμον ὡς ὑπὸ νόμον, μὴ ὢν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον κερδήσω· ²¹ τοῖς ἀνόμοις ὡς ἄνομος, μὴ ὢν ἄνομος θεοῦ ἀλλ' ἔννομος Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κερδάω τοὺς ἀνόμους· ²² ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν ἀσθενής, ἵνα τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς κερδήσω· τοῖς πᾶσιν γέγονα πάντα, ἵνα πάντως τινὰς σώσω. ²³ πάντα δὲ ποιῶ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἵνα συγκαινωνὸς αὐτοῦ γένωμαι. (1 Corinthians 9:19-23 NA²⁸)

In relation to the issue of identity formation, the assertions by Paul in 1 Corinthians has precipitated some interesting discussions. Even though there are perceptions that these assertions are evidence that Paul cannot be tied down to any one particular ethnic identity, in this typical case a *Ioudaios* one,⁶⁵ a more careful discussion within the context of his rhetoric (1 Corinthians 8-11) reveals the opposite.⁶⁶ Both Cavan Concannon (2014) and Mark D. Nanos (2017a) have addressed this passage and these issues. Caroline Johnson Hodge (2005) has also made a contribution to this discussion on navigating Paul's identity formation with regards to Galatians 2.⁶⁷ Firstly, Concannon demonstrates that such "rhetoric of ethnic

suggest identity. As again, Paul's relationship and rhetoric in communication to his Gentile audience has often led to, what I assume is a misinterpretation or misunderstanding of his own identity, especially when scholars that assume that Paul converted to become a Christian or apostatized his Judean ethnocultural belief, and so on.

⁶⁵ Beyond discussions of ethnicity and identity, Mark D. Nanos has observed that "1 Corinthians 9:19-23,... is widely perceived to support the traditional conceptualization of Paulinism (i.e., privileging of gentleness, freedom from Torah and Jewish identity) and to counter any challenges mounted against it" (Nanos, 2017a: 54). He has stressed that he finds "no reason to believe that the recipients of Paul's letters, who knew him personally, or knew others who did (in the case of Rome), would interpret his language in terms of later 'Paulinism,' a construction of Paul that operates around the proposition that the role of Torah to express covenant faithfulness had ended for Christians—often applied to everyone else too— whether Jew or non-Jew" (2017a: 54).

⁶⁶ Margaret M. Mitchell (1991: 39–50) has shown that in ancient deliberative rhetoric, it is common for a rhetor to set examples and even cite themselves as examples for emulation by their audience. It is certainly within such a rhetorical construct that Paul's assertions in Chapter 9 should be read and understood.

⁶⁷ With respect to Galatians 2, Johnson Hodge writes: "What does it mean for Paul to 'go to' the gentiles? How does Paul manage this crossing of ethnic boundaries? Does it compromise his identity as *Ioudaios* to do so? Traditionally, the answer to these questions has been conceived in terms of a Judean/Christian dichotomy: when Paul teaches the gospel of Christ, he leaves his ethnic Judaism for a universal Christianity. Paul is often viewed as a critic of Judean "ethnocentrism," the tendency to privilege the chosen status and the

malleability” (2014: 27) was not unusual in the ancient world. Hence, like the orator Favorinus (whose example of such rhetoric Concannon discusses extensively), “Paul sought to influence Corinthian audiences and defend his authority by prominently displaying his body as able to negotiate multiple ethnic and cultural identities” (Concannon, 2014: 28). Approaching the subject of ethnicity and identity, Johnson Hodge (2005) has suggested that “we conceptualize identity in a more complex way. Instead of understanding ethnic identity as monolithic and fixed, imagine it to be multifaceted and flexible” (2005: 271). Based on this, she proposes two principles for consideration when approaching discussion on ethnicity and identity formation: “first, they are context-specific, meaning that certain identities are relevant or important in certain situations” and “second, identities are not of equal value to the person who holds them; some are ranked higher than others” (2005: 271–272).⁶⁸ As mentioned above, Johnson Hodge’s discussion was based generally on Galatians and not on 1 Corinthians,⁶⁹ nonetheless, it is worth noting, briefly, the conclusion she reached, in respect of Paul’s ethnicity and identity formation,⁷⁰ as we ascertain the discussions on 1 Corinthians 9:19-23. From Galatians 2:11-14, Johnson Hodge addresses the conflict or disagreement that arose between Paul and Peter. And she argues that Paul makes shifts within his nested

observance of the Law which defines *Ioudaioi* as a people (here physically manifested through the male body). Instead, Paul favors the inclusive gospel of Christ, where social identities and hierarchies fade” (2005: 270–271). In her work, she refutes this aforementioned traditional approach and proposes a more profound approach.

⁶⁸ Johnson Hodge applies these two models to Paul’s ethnicity and identity formation, referring to Romans 11:1-2 and Philippians 3:5-6. She asserts that “while all of these components...belong under the larger umbrella of Judeanness, each item is also a distinct identity itself, which could be emphasized or de-emphasized depending on the context” (2005: 275). And within Galatians, the main focus of her work, she identifies two additional components: Paul “in Christ” and “called by God to be an apostle to the gentiles” (2005: 276) as part of his nested identities. Concerning these two components, she asserts that “it is important to recognize that both of these additional segments fall within *Judean* boundaries: Paul understands his faithfulness to Christ as faithfulness to God and Israel. Indeed, Paul views his own work among gentiles as a continuation of the venerable tradition of Israelite prophets who were called to the nations... Thus Paul’s work as a teacher of gentiles is a part of the larger story of Israel, not a break from it” (Johnson Hodge, 2005: 276, italics in original).

⁶⁹ Even though from pp. 283-285, her analysis spills into this passage (Johnson Hodge, 2005).

⁷⁰ I will not elaborate on her exegesis or interpretation of the issues in Galatians 2:11-14. See the core of her argument in (Johnson Hodge, 2005: 277–287).

identities (of his Judeanness) in order to reach the gentile community, in that case, the Galatians for Christ (see Johnson Hodge, 2005: 277–278). The crux of the matter is that the nature of this shift, she observes, is behavioural and not an abandoning of his Judeanness (see 2005: 278).⁷¹ In agreement with Mark D. Nanos (2002), her explanation of the conflict indicates that the reason for the panic on Peter’s part with the arrival of those from James (Galatians 2:12) was not merely that they (Paul, Peter and all those with them) were eating with the gentiles but rather the *manner* in which it was being done (see 2005: 279); hence, her view that Paul was not compromising his relationship to the Law in any sense, by merely eating with gentiles.⁷² Even though she agrees with Nanos on the above, her subsequent position on Galatians 2:19, specifically on Paul’s statement that- ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, is in sharp disagreement with Nanos (see 2005:280-281).⁷³ Nonetheless, both of these scholars hold strongly to the view that Paul did not give up either his Judeanness (as suggested by Caroline Johnson Hodge) or his covenant faithfulness to the Torah (Mark D. Nanos) as a result of his mission to the gentiles. This is a perspective this research seeks to establish as well through a literary analysis of 1 Corinthians 15, exploring the evidence that Paul’s rhetoric in the text functions with his use of Scripture and *Ioudaios* concepts as a central pivot. Johnson Hodge’s two-principle approach mentioned above, are the key factors that separate her from Nanos’ (2002) view on this discussion and subsequently, as I seek to

⁷¹ Referring to Galatians 2:19 - ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῶ ζήσω. Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι, she explains that “interpreted within the framework of multiple and complex identifies, Galatians 2:19 suggests that Paul has shifted the components of his identity in order to gain access to gentile communities. Paul has adjusted his own strict keeping of the Law—he used to be blameless—so that he can eat and live with gentiles without asking them to observe the Law” (Johnson Hodge, 2005: 278).

⁷² I must indicate, here, that Johnson Hodge’s use of Law in these contexts implies a broad sense, that is, the totality of Jewish Scripture and all the ceremonial rites (see Johnson Hodge, 2005: 278–281).

⁷³ This difference in opinions will be seen more fully when I discuss 1 Corinthians 9:19-23 and draw out the prevailing assertions. Johnson Hodge writes that “Nanos’ view nonetheless challenges my thesis that Paul reprioritized the components of his Judean identity, placing Law observation below his duties as an apostle to the gentiles. He would argue that no such reprioritizing was necessary. I disagree with Nanos on this point. Paul’s statement that ‘through the Law I died to the Law’ (Gal. 2:19), plus his juxtaposition of ‘living *ethnikos*’ and ‘living *Ioudaikos*’ (2:14), convince me that Paul thought some sort of accommodation was necessary” (2005: 280).

demonstrate below, these principles can perhaps enable us understand the issues concerning Paul's identity formation and function in 1 Corinthians 9:19-23.⁷⁴

Now in the specific context of 1 Corinthians 9:19-23 (see the Greek text above), the issues to be noted are the following: firstly, should this passage be read literally or metaphorically and what will be the underlying implications of such a position? Secondly, who are the categories of people Paul mentions, and is it crucial to identify them in order to arrive at a decision on Paul's ethnicity and identity formation? Finally, what becomes of the expression ἐγενόμην...ὥς, which runs through the pericope under discussion?

Mark D. Nanos (2017a) focuses on how this passage plays out on Paul's relationship to the Torah, which must inevitably be linked to discussions about his ethnicity and identity formation. His key objectives are wrestling this passage from a traditional interpretation which yields a conceptualization of Christianization of Paul or a Paulinism and various adaptability models proposed over the centuries (see Nanos, 2017a: 52–71). His own position is that the passage should be read solely metaphorically, and thus Paul's statements should be regarded solely as rhetorical adaptability (see Nanos, 2017a: 71–88). Nanos provides sound arguments for the latter possibility regarding, emphasizing that Paul was laying out his “evangelizing tactics in 9:19-23” (2017a: 73). Nanos cites Luke's account of Paul in Acts 17 as an example of another instance where Paul exercised rhetorical adaptability, by which Nanos implies “what Paul is describing requires knowing how to communicate effectively, and within the limits of his objectives” (2017a: 78); as such it referred only to speech behaviour and not actual behavioural conduct (see Nanos, 2017a: 72). As much as I agree with Nanos on the rhetorical context of the passage and Paul's rhetorical adaptability, I would disagree that that is the only form of adaptability at work within the text and in Paul's own

⁷⁴ She asserts that “a model of multiple identities illuminates how Paul can relate to gentiles without giving up his identity as a *Ioudaios*. This dynamic view of Paul's self-concept is at work in this passage: in response to God's call to be an apostle to the gentiles, Paul lives ‘gentilelishly’” (Johnson Hodge, 2005: 282).

gentile mission. This is because by keeping strictly to a metaphorical reading or solely to a rhetorical adaptability understanding of Paul's actions and of the passage, Nanos' response to the second question is that "as interesting as it is to imagine who each of the specific referents represent and why Paul chose these referents to exemplify his tactics— Jews, those under the law, the lawless, or the weak— or how any or all of these relate to Torah observance, or not, it is not necessary to do so on the interpretation I propose" (2017a: 77). Consequently, Nanos' response to the expression ἐγενόμην...ὡς, is as follows: "that instead of 'behaving like' ...this language signifies how Paul *reasons like* and *relates* his convictions *like*, how he *engages like*, how he rhetorically meets people where they are, according to their own worldviews and premises... In this rhetorical, discursive sense Paul could actually *become like*—or even *become—everything to everyone*" (2017a: 77, italics in original). As indicated, Nanos arrives at these conclusions because he chooses to read the passage as solely metaphorical and Paul's claims as amounting to solely rhetorical adaptability. This approach, he is convinced, "eliminates the charges against Paul, at least on the basis of this text, of moral dishonesty, hypocrisy, misrepresentation, trickery, inconsistency, subversion of principles for expedience, and practical shortsightedness" (2017a: 87).

I have indicated that I agree with Nanos that the passage holds potential to be read metaphorically and also that Paul is applying rhetorical adaptability. However, I disagree that this is the only force at work within the passage. In the pericope of 1 Corinthians 8-11, the immediate literary context within which 9:19-23 falls, Paul was calling the Corinthian Jesus-followers, not just to a rhetorical or speech behavioural change or adaptation, but more crucially, to a lifestyle or conduct behavioural adaptability. It is on this premise that I concur, in agreement with Johnson Hodge's (2005) argument on Galatians 2:11-14, that Paul was demonstrating by example for emulation, both rhetorical adaptability and lifestyle

adaptability.⁷⁵ In her article with which I engaged above, Johnson Hodge (2005) does not use the term lifestyle adaptability directly, but she acknowledges the expression through words such as “shift,” “accommodation,” and “living or acting like” (see 2005: 278–285) which she uses to describe how Paul negotiates his nested identities as he engages with gentiles whilst maintaining his Judeanness.

Nanos’ objections against lifestyle adaptability can perhaps be resolved through an understanding of what Johnson Hodge proposes, when she expresses the opinion that “Paul has given up *advantages* of his Judean identity in order to put first his identity as an apostle ‘in Christ’” (2005: 285, emphasis mine). In correlation, through 1 Corinthians 8-11, Paul was calling on his communities of Jesus-followers by example to make similar lifestyle or behavioural adaptation (see Johnson Hodge, 2005: 286).⁷⁶ Unlike Nanos’ solely rhetorical adaptability approach, my proposal of a both rhetorical and lifestyle adaptability approach does not require readers to ignore the people-group categories Paul alludes to in the passage. Concannon (2014: 29–31) has given a plausible response to what can most likely represent the categories of people-groups Paul mentions in the passage above.

⁷⁵ I borrow this terminology from Nanos (2017a) but apply it with a rather important revision of the traditional perspective which is not made explicit in his explanation. Nanos discusses this approach borrowing from the work by Paul Gooch (1978) but claims to make some modifications. According to Nanos, “Gooch describes this category as ‘ethical accommodation,’ that which is ‘concerned not with the truth or transmission of beliefs, but with *behavior*. It is practiced whenever one *adapts his pattern of living to the lifestyles of various groups*, having his *actions* dictated by the situations and circumstances in which he finds himself.’ Gooch places Paul in this category, and expresses the view that Paul has left Judaism and a Torah-defined way of life following his conversion to Christianity” (2017a: n35). Nanos refutes this position and rather describes this definition of lifestyle adaptability as deceptive, pretense, mimicking and illogical to achieve (see 2017a: 75–77). As I will explain, my review of lifestyle adaptability does not require any of the above objections; nor does it strip Paul of his Judean identity. The multiple ethnic and identity formation model proposed by Johnson Hodge (2005) above it can explain how Paul and many contemporaries like him could negotiate their nested identities without giving up their core identity or acting hypocritically in any way. I assert that at the core Paul remained faithful through and through to the Torah and his calling in Christ as *Ioudaios*.

⁷⁶ And not just here in 1 Corinthians 8-11, but throughout Paul’s gospel message to the gentiles he calls them to lifestyle adaptability as part of their in-Christness. Johnson Hodge speaks to this: “Paul expects gentiles in Christ to make more radical adjustments than he has made. For example, they must give up their gods and religious practices in order to proclaim loyalty to the God of Israel; they must accept Israel’s messiah, scriptures, stories of origin, ethical standards and even ancestry! Thus being ‘in Christ’ for gentiles involves a complex rearrangement of self-concepts... To teach the gentiles, Paul has reprioritized the various facets of his identity so he can live as a gentile. In turn, he asks the gentiles to make more radical changes as they adopt— and are adopted by— the God of Israel” (2005: 286–287).

He has summarized these as follows: “the three categories cover the three types of people with whom Paul has associated. From his letters we know that he has worked with *Ioudaioi*, Gentiles seeking to place themselves under the authority of the Mosaic law (Galatians and Romans), and Gentiles not connected with the law. Thus, this tripartite division of humanity corresponds to the scope of the Pauline mission as Paul has described it” (2014: 30–31). In other words, they are regarded as possibly actual categories or variations of people-groups to whom Paul had and continued to minister the gospel message. Obviously, Paul’s mentioning of the ἀσθενής is a flashback reminder to his audience from 1 Corinthians 8, the key reason for his rhetoric in Chapter 9.⁷⁷ Finally, then, on the expression ἐγενόμην...ὡς, I propose that it refers to both Paul’s “reasoning ...as or like” and “becoming...as or like”;⁷⁸ both reflecting the rhetorical adaptability and lifestyle adaptability Paul clearly exhibited and required of his audience to imitate or emulate.

In summary, this section has displayed how Paul through his use of *Ioudaios* concepts and worldview and the Scriptures of Israel aimed to shape the identity of his gentiles-in-Christ, an identity which carries unresolved ambiguities and perhaps Paul expected these to remain as such. For the benefit of Scripture translation, “they show how Paul’s reworking of these materials was part of a broader practice of changing, adapting, and *translating* these traditions into new contexts throughout the Mediterranean. Though we often tend to see Paul’s use of these traditions as a ‘Christian’ expropriation of ‘Jewish’ materials, it is worth remembering that Paul, a Judean of the diaspora, was one of many Jewish authors who recast these stories to fit the contexts in which they found themselves” (Concannon, 2014: 99–100,

⁷⁷ It will be impossible to go into a discussion or ascertaining here who the ἀσθενής are in the passage. For a contemporary perspective on the subject see (Nanos, 2017b,b).

⁷⁸ In Matthew 18:3 - καὶ εἶπεν· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, the writer uses a similar expression (γένησθε ὡς) to express the behavioural change Jesus requires of his disciples if they will enter the kingdom of heaven. It is obvious in this context, that Jesus is not expecting the disciples to lose their adulthood and begin to reason or act childishly. Just as in 1 Corinthians 9:19-23 and here in Matthew, there is agreement that the expression refers to a change in lifestyle (in the case of Matthew, pride on the part of the disciples and adopting the humility of a child).

emphasis mine). Paul's nested identities, whilst undergoing constant rhetorical and lifestyle adaptations in connection with his in-Christness and gentile mission as an apostle, at the core, continued to remain true and faithful to the ethnocultural heritage and to the God of his ancestors; this identity is consistently *Ioudaios* through and through. Once again, in Chapter 5, the literary analysis approach that would be used to discuss 1 Corinthians 15 will demonstrate a dimension of Paul's rhetorical adaptability.

3.7 Translation and Contemporary African Communities as Implied Audience and Readers: Context, Ethnicity and Identity Formation

In certain ways, the political and social situation of the African continent, in the twenty-first century, may not be so far removed from that of Paul's Roman Corinth. Like Corinth, Africa has been a colonized continent. And till today, there are discussions of neo-colonialism indicating modern influences of "colonial-overlords" in the affairs of a seemingly politically and socially "independent" continent. There are evidently various social and religio-cultural identity struggles underway on the continent with forces such as westernization, globalization and social technological advancement via the proliferation of social media platforms. Underlying all these developments, is a deep subconscious of the primal imagination⁷⁹ that is latent and continues to permeate the life of African people both through cultural and religious expressions. This is an indication of a multifaceted context.

On the subject of context and identity, Gillian Bediako (2000) has described "primal" as "the varied, yet common, religious traditions around the world from which the majority of the world's Christians have come; whether it be the Semitic religion of the Old Testament period, the religions of Greece and Rome in the early Christian era, the religions of the tribes-people of northern and western Europe from the 4th and 5th centuries onwards, and in the 19th and

⁷⁹ See a preliminary discussion of this expression in Chapter 2.

20th centuries, the indigenous religions of Latin America or parts of Asia and especially Africa” (Bediako, 2000: 12). Gleaning from her description of what primal represents, Paul’s *Ioudaios* or Semitic ethnocultural heritage and identity could very well be regarded as anterior and fundamental to his nested identity in Christ. And this also applies very well to the communities of Jesus-followers to whom he presented the gospel message in Roman Corinth. Once again, Gillian Bediako has helpfully stated that “the mission to the Gentiles initiated supremely by the apostle Paul, was to peoples from the primal religious world of Greece and Rome” (2000: 14). Hence, in cases of both Paul and his Roman Corinth audience, the presence of a primal worldview being anterior and fundamental to their encounter with the Gospel message was crucial to the process of identity-shaping that was taking place, which has also been discussed above. Though *Ioudaios*, Paul communicated to his audience in their mother-tongue (engaging with their own idioms, metaphors and ethnocultural expressions), whilst in no way alienating his own ethnocultural heritage. As Chapters 4 to 6 will attempt to show, it is by this that in his communication of the gospel to them, he had to repackage and translate linguistically (and rhetorically), where necessary, *Ioudaios* concepts and expressions alongside his use of the Scriptures of Israel. Both for his own identity-making and for that of his Roman Corinthian audience, it can be emphasized (with clear evidence from the preceding discussions) that Paul attempts to build upon (not so much as to suppress or neglect) and not supersede that which is fundamental to their encounter with the divine (see Bediako, 2000: 12).⁸⁰

Therefore, in relation to the task of Bible engagement and translation work in Africa, some crucial questions to ask are the following: how is the Bible, especially in the mother-tongue translations, shaping African identity(-ies)? Is there a foreignising effect taking place or a

⁸⁰ Here again, Luke’s presentation of Paul’s Mars Hill encounter in Acts 17 is a classic example of a rhetoric that engages and attempts to build upon the primal worldview of the people of Athens to bring them to the knowledge of the gospel message.

conscious attempt to bring African communities to a manifestation of their self-identity(-ies) and struggle, whether socially or culturally-related? How can translation teams appropriate rhetorical adaptability, in the specific context of Africa, as they undertake the task of Scripture translation? Issues of identity, concerning Africa, have been discussed in the previous chapter and as well as here. Scripture translation shapes the identity(-ies) of a people's social and cultural world. It is important, therefore, that such an important activity be divorced from any neo-colonizing effects, and instead, through the Scriptures, the African can celebrate and worship God in their nested identity(-ies).

3.8 Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has attempted to show that, firstly, Paul's mission to the Jesus-followers in Roman Corinth took place in a multifaceted context. This is a context that manifested dynamically in all spheres of social and cultural experience. It has been established further that the situation of the recipients of this letter, as a micro-niche of the broader Roman Corinthian society, also manifested a similar multifaceted nature, and these factors certainly had an impact on the letter Paul wrote to them and on his gospel mission. Hence, simplistic approaches or methodologies that end up making sweeping assumptions about his audience and further, about Paul's literary-rhetorical intentions or motives and techniques in his use of Scriptures of Israel and concepts, fail to convince. Therefore, it is necessary to observe the complexity of the context and rhetorical situation of these recipients as well as Paul's own rhetoric of addressing the issues. The multi-ethnocultural and identity formation flux of his audience as "gentiles-in-Christ" coupled with his own *Ioudaios* nested identities undergoing rhetorical and lifestyle adaptability in his cross-cultural mission,

definitely caution interpreters and especially, Scripture translators to be more critical when re-communicating these texts into similarly multifaceted African contexts.

The next chapter will initiate a more focussed discussion of 1 Corinthians 15.

CHAPTER 4

4.0 1 Corinthians 15: Paul's Use and Reading of the Scriptures of Israel and *Ioudaios* Concepts

4.1 Introduction

So far in this study, Paul has been located within the first century CE identified as having *Ioudaios* ethnocultural ancestry. It has also been discussed how within the variety of his nested *Ioudaios* identities he was able to carry out a cross-cultural or intercultural mission without succumbing to any form of secession from his *Ioudaios* identity and the Torah of his ancestors. These assertions have also been ascertained about the identity of the gentiles-in-Christ communities to whom he witnessed the Gospel message, both physically in person and through the letters he wrote. These first century CE Pauline communities were by Paul's own conscious effort and aspirations gentiles-in-Christ, and yet occupied a liminal space, of course, as far as portrayed in the Pauline letters. The scene has been set up to have another look now at Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel, *Ioudaios* concepts, expressions and worldview and their literary-rhetorical function as related to translation studies.

In the ancient Mediterranean world of the first century CE, Paul was not alone in activities engaging with ancient Scriptures, rhetoric and interpretation of texts and traditions. Historically there are identifiable ancient patterns along which various experts or practitioners handled texts and traditions in the Greco-Roman world in both Hellenistic and *Ioudaios* contexts. These will be surveyed briefly, focusing on the latter setting. Consequently, I will discuss the possibility of locating Paul's own practice within this myriad of techniques (science) and the art of his *Ioudaios* setting, applying a literary critical approach rather than the well-known historical-critical methodologies. None of these efforts are to discount or downplay the presence and influence of Greco-Roman methods in Paul's

writings.⁸¹ One can refer to Stanley, in relation to Greco-Roman citation practice in the first century CE and Paul's practice, who critiques Dietrich-Alex Koch's perception that "both the highly fluid textual tradition on which the Greco-Roman citations are based and the wholly different relation of the author to the literature cited – i.e., its lack of normative value as "Scripture" to him – render all such comparisons useless" (1990: 49). His proposition and conclusion at the end of his study is worth noting here:

Greco-Roman literature of the first century CE affords significant parallels to the normal citation practices of the apostle Paul. The failure of previous studies to identify these parallels points up the need for additional research in this area. The question of whether Paul absorbed these techniques directly from his Greco-Roman environment or whether they might have been mediated to him through his Jewish upbringing must remain open pending further studies in the citation techniques of Diaspora Judaism. Whatever the outcome, however, it can be affirmed with confidence that in his manner of handling literary citations, Paul was in every respect a man of his world (Stanley, 1990: 78).

Stanley (1992) provides an extensive discussion on this same theme with respect to citation techniques in the Greco-Roman world.

Paul's use of Scripture, as a field of study, has flourished in recent decades. Also 1 Corinthians, as a primary letter of Paul has been studied extensively along this line. This applies also about the Chapter 15 of 1 Corinthians, which is the main focus of this research. This chapter reviews these discussions from a literary-rhetorical perspective, which has implications for the field of translation studies focusing on the context in Africa.

4.2 Paul and Ancient First Century CE *Ioudaios* Techniques of Scripture Citation, Exegesis and Interpretation

Even though this work uses the literary critical analysis of the themes to be discussed, it is necessary to open these discussions with what has pertained prior to the contemporary

⁸¹ See my earlier discussions in Chapter 2 of this research which acknowledges that Paul's Greco-Roman setting played varied roles in his literary works as well as his ministry.

developments of literary critical approaches in investigations of Paul's methodology linked with his use of the Scriptures of Israel. This section, presents a critical review of scholarly works on the subject that depend primarily on historical-critical approaches.

Steve Moyise has observed: "Paul uses many of the techniques found at Qumran, such as typology, allegory, catch-word links, altering texts, reading texts in an unusual manner and borrowing from Jewish *haggada*" (2001: 95, italics in original). This is a similar conclusion to that of scholars who take the historical-critical approach to discussing Paul's hermeneutical method⁸² of reading the Scriptures of Israel. C.D. Stanley (1992) has also made the assertion that "once all the relevant materials have been taken into consideration, it will be seen that Paul employs no citation technique that cannot be traced directly to Jewish or Greco-Roman antecedents. In fact, much of what is generally regarded as 'unique' in Paul's handling of Scripture will be shown to have clear parallels in the Greco-Roman literature of his day. *It is his conclusions, not his practice, that marks Paul as a 'Christian' expositor of Scripture*" (1992: 268–269, emphasis mine). Stanley's conclusions are drawn from his selective study of citation technique from Greco-Roman literature and early Judean ethno-culture (see 1992: 267–338). Concerning the citation technique in the latter, which is my focus for this study, he selects some literature and traditions from Qumran (the non-*persher* materials), Apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, and from Philo. His deductions from the first category are summarized as follows: "the resemblance to the citation technique of the apostle Paul is too close to be overlooked. At the same time, the results are by no means uniform. In documents such as *4QTestimonia*, *11QMelchizedek*, and *IQS*, verbatim citation appears to be the norm. In other texts – *4QFlorilegium*, *IQM*, and especially *CD* – a wide range of adaptations can be found.

⁸² My use of this term of reference for Paul's reading of Scripture is cautioned by the same words expressed by Punt: "The term 'Pauline hermeneutics' is premeditated, cognizant however of the fact that Paul never in his letters available to us embarked on a systematic discussion of his 'hermeneutics' in the modern sense of the word: the term is used for Paul's theory and practice in as far as he uses and interprets Scripture and possibly other traditions as well. The other modern cultural and theological baggage assigned to 'hermeneutics' is neither implied nor assumed in my use of the term when applied to Pauline writings" (1996: 381 n.18).

Clearly, it is this latter group of texts that stands closest to the way citations are handled in the Pauline epistles” (Stanley, 1992: 306). Therefore, in all, according to Stanley, “the Qumran materials offer strong evidence that the practices observed thus far are part of a broader cultural phenomenon that understood and made allowance for such ‘interpretive renderings’ of well-known and/or authoritative texts” (1992: 306). This conclusion is no different from his observations with the second category which focuses on apocrypha and pseudepigrapha (see Stanley, 1992: 323). Finally, Stanley outlines eight similarities that align Philo’s citation techniques with that of Paul (and the New Testament writers as well) (see Stanley, 1992: 334–336). On the whole, with respect to the context, Stanley observes that “such broad-based agreement on such a common matter must be regarded as strong evidence for a general cultural and literary ethos in which incorporating interpretive elements into the wording of a quotation was considered a normal and acceptable means of advancing one’s argument” (1992: 337). Specifically with reference to Paul he remarks that “as a Jewish writer of the first century C.E. who traveled extensively throughout the eastern Mediterranean world, Paul was nurtured in the values and practices of both Jewish and Greco-Roman culture from his infancy. It therefore comes as no surprise to discover a close correlation between the citation technique of the apostle Paul and that of his Jewish and Greco-Roman contemporaries” (1992: 338). Prior to Stanley’s work, three scholars have made notably similar attempts to draw parallels between Paul’s interaction with the Scriptures of Israel and that of his contemporary first century CE literary world (specifically *Ioudaios* context). They are E.E. Ellis (1957), Longenecker (1975) and Fishbane (1985).⁸³ As insightful as these works are, their historical methodological approach to the discussion has been criticized to be

⁸³ Michael Fishbane’s (1985) work does not deal directly with Paul nor his use of Scripture. Nonetheless, his academic exploration of the subject of Scripture interpretation in ancient times throws light on how the New Testament writers (Paul included) perceived and used the Scriptures.

inadequate and often anachronistic posing limitations. Jeremy Punt has expressed this problem convincingly:

It can be argued that a simplistic appeal to Jewish and early rabbinic practices of interpretation to explain Pauline interpretive wranglings of Scripture, might be found too easy. It will not suffice to argue that as the Jews regarded their sacred texts very highly yet saw fit to adapt them for contemporary purposes, Paul merely did the same. All the difficulties in Pauline hermeneutics and his interpretive methodology cannot be explained with a simple reference to Jewish methods. However, a study of Jewish interpretive assumptions and methodology does bring one a long way down the road of understanding Pauline hermeneutics (1996: 388).

Almost a decade before Punt's statement, R.B. Hays penned the following criticism: "The great majority of critical studies of Paul's use of the Old Testament, however, have avoided frontal engagement with these hermeneutical perplexities, concentrating instead, more modestly, on essential technical tasks of scholarship" (1989: 9). For Hays, "the Pauline quotations and allusions have been catalogued, their introductory formulas classified, their relation to various Old Testament text-traditions examined, their exegetical methods compared to the methods of other interpreters within ancient Christianity and Judaism" (1989: 9). That which remains a pressing issue for redress, which also forms a concern of this research is what Hays has observed: "Most of the 'unpacking' of the Pauline citations was complete more than a generation ago, yet we still lack a satisfying account of Paul's letters as 'hermeneutical events,' discourse in which Paul is engaged in the act of *reinterpreting* Scripture to address the concerns of his communities" (1989: 9, emphasis mine). The use of "reinterpreting" to describe Paul's use of Scripture is crucial to demonstrate and activate Paul's conscious or intentional (not merely passive) activity as he engages rigorously with these texts and traditions. Hays (1989) has also summed up into five categories the major questions scholars have battled with surrounding Paul's use of Scripture. I refer to them here as follows:

1. Questions of textual criticism: what form of the Old Testament text was known and used by Paul? 2. Questions of incidence of citation: which Old Testament books and passages does Paul quote? 3. Questions of sources and historical background: what sort of interpretive community tradition, if any, does Paul represent?... 4. Questions of theological legitimacy: does Paul use the Old Testament with exegetical-theological integrity, or does he rifle it for prooftexts and twist its meaning?... 5. Questions of biblical inspiration and authority: what doctrine of the origin and normative claim of Scripture did Paul hold (1989: 9–10)?

The issues of question 4 and perhaps, 5 are closely aligned with the investigations of this research. Once again, Hays (1989) has elaborated further on this: “the question of how Paul read Scripture is of great importance for grasping the logic and purpose of his arguments. Is there some method or hermeneutic that can account for Paul’s exegesis? Is he a completely idiosyncratic reader? How are we to understand the literary and theological transformations that occur when Paul cites and alludes to Scripture?” (1989: 10). The latter question is where this research intends to make a unique recommendation or contribution, in that it emphasizes the importance of paying attention to the dynamics of re-translation (not merely interpretation) and re-interpretation as a phenomena and principle that are underneath (foundational to) Paul’s use of the *Ioudaios* texts and traditions of his ancestors. This will be discussed in the next section.

The other questions (1, 2 and 3) need to be discussed briefly under this section. Firstly, concerning the questions of textual criticism, it is generally agreed that Paul’s “dependence on the current Greek translation of his day is clearly established, but there is good reason to think that he was familiar with the original Hebrew” (Silva, 1993: 632). E.E. Ellis reckons similarly that “the priority of the LXX in Pauline quotations has long been recognised... Affinities with the LXX are not only evident in Paul’s quotations but extend to his general style and vocabulary as well” (1957: 12–13). He has also estimated that “fifty-one of Paul’s citations are in absolute or virtual agreement with the LXX” (1957: 12).⁸⁴ Ellis also entertains the theory that “Aramaic texts of some type probably lie behind some of the citations” (1957:

⁸⁴ E.E. Ellis’ study “includes the traditional Pauline corpus with the exception of Hebrews” (1957: 5).

16).⁸⁵ More recently, beyond the notion of Aramaic texts, Satlow has elaborated on this theory suggesting that “Paul almost never cites the Hebrew version of Scripture because he did not know Hebrew. He does at times appear to be consulting written versions of the Septuagint, but primarily he worked from memory of verses that he knew in Aramaic. This is why in the overwhelming majority of cases Paul’s citations match neither the extant Greek nor Hebrew versions; they were filtered through both a translation and vagaries (and desires) of memory” (Satlow, 2018: 271).⁸⁶ Satlow’s hint that Paul’s citations demonstrate possible translation phenomena is an important statement. Also, it is impossible to rule out the place of memory in Paul’s use of Scripture. Unfortunately, even though this should not be so, some scholars (like Satlow) rather invoke the case of memory to explain what they recognize as “errors” in certain citations in the Pauline letters. Ellis has expressed this caution well as follows:

‘Memory quotation’ should be understood, however, as a free rendering in accordance with literary custom or for an exegetical purpose, rather than as a result of ‘memory lapse’. The importance of scriptural memorization for the Jew, Paul’s rabbinic training, and the verbal exactness of many of his quotations, militate against the latter explanation. Moreover, the large measure of agreement with the LXX seems *to reflect a conscious desire to reproduce a given text*; it cautions against resorting to ‘free quoting from memory’ as soon as differences arise (Ellis, 1957: 14–15, emphasis mine).

This research acknowledges this “conscious desire” on the part of Paul, to be at work whether citing from a text of any form or memory. It is also argued that any such incidence of so-called “memory lapse” on the part of Paul should rather be redefined and recognised as conscious acts of translating and reinterpreting the text and traditions for his gentiles-in-

⁸⁵ Silva has made an observation on this as well: “it is also reasonable to think that Paul would have learned from the targumic tradition, that is, the Aramaic interpretive renderings of the Hebrew Bible that were part of the synagogue liturgy (whether written targumim were available to him is debated). The most convincing example of targumic influence is found in one of the disputed letters, Ephesians 4:8 (= Ps 68:18), which uses the verb “gave” as in the targum, whereas both MT and LXX have “took” ... Some scholars have also tried to explain Paul’s use of Deuteronomy 30:12-14 in Romans 10:6-8 by appealing to a targumic tradition, but even this instance is debatable” (1993: 635).

⁸⁶ Satlow arrives at the proposal of Paul not knowing Hebrew based on a reconstruction of Luke’s biography of Paul in the Acts of the Apostles. See Chapter 2 for my discussion on these assertions.

Christ audience. Subsequently, the issues relating to textual criticism and Paul's use of Scripture do get more complex. Silva has indicated this: "the OT Greek text itself was not uniform. What we (naively) call the Septuagint, or LXX, is really a collection of various translations done at different times by different people who had differing skills and different approaches... As a result, determining what may have been the actual form of the so-called 'Old Greek,' and thus whether that was the form used by Paul, can be a challenge" (1993: 633). Already before Silva's comments, the difficulties and limitations of depending on textual criticism as final authorities of Paul's Scripture use were observed, for example in the works of scholars such as Hays (1989).⁸⁷

Secondly, like other scholars, Satlow has responded to questions concerning which Old Testament books Paul cites often: "Paul cites from fifteen of the books that comprise our Hebrew Bible... Paul cites most from Isaiah, Psalms, Genesis, Deuteronomy, Exodus, Leviticus, and Hosea, with only one or two citations from the remaining books" (2018: 269). Based on this as additional evidence, he proceeds to align Paul's technique with Palestine (vis-à-vis Qumran) rather than the diaspora (see Satlow, 2018: 270). The discussion concerning Paul and Qumran will be picked up again.

For the third question from the categories above, Hays (1989) provides an important response concerning the "questions of sources and historical background: what sort of interpretive community tradition, if any, does Paul represent? Included among the answers to such questions are the many recent efforts to demonstrate in detail that Paul's exegesis is

⁸⁷ Hays makes the following remark which is worth closing this section on the discussion of Pauline citations and textual criticism: At least since the beginnings of the critical study of the Bible in the Enlightenment, careful readers have noted the striking verbal divergence of many New Testament quotations from their putative Old Testament sources. Early scholarly studies of these quotations often treated them as problems to be solved through textual criticism. Within the past century, however, scholars have generally conceded that Paul's use of Scripture cannot be explained simply through appeals to variant textual traditions and that the issues raised by his readings are fundamentally hermeneutical issues, because of the undeniable gap between the "original sense" of the Old Testament texts and Paul's interpretation, even in cases where the citations are in verbatim agreement with the LXX. This gap has generated a wide variety of critical responses, ranging along a spectrum from outraged dismissal to fervent apology (1989: 6).

midrashic, that it represents the exegetical methods and traditions of Pharisaic (nascent rabbinic) Judaism. Also, to be placed in this category are investigations of Paul's use of early Christian exegetical traditions and testimonies" (1989: 9). Ellis' (1957) discussion of Jewish literary methods as related to Paul's, deduces that "in all things but allegorical interpretation, Paul's Jewish methodology reflects a Palestinian milieu, and even in that the Alexandrian contact does not appear to be close or direct. The apostle is not averse to using methods from his Jewish training as they suit his purpose; on the other hand, some of his methods seem to arise from a Christian hermeneutic and from the practices of the apostolic community and cannot be explained by his Jewish background" (1957: 54, see also 1957: 80–82).⁸⁸ Elsewhere, he has also made similar arguments with respect to Paul's introductory formulas (see Ellis, 1957: 48). Satlow also affirms (even though with some hesitation) that "Paul's introductions to direct scriptural citations—his so-called 'introductory formulae'—and the purpose to which he uses these citations tend to resemble Palestinian Jewish literature to a far greater extent than they resemble Jewish literature written in Greek, presumably outside of Palestine" (2018: 272; see also Silva, 1993: 636).⁸⁹ Silva (1993) has affirmed as well that "the most obvious feature common to both Qumran and Paul is the use of certain expressions to introduce explicit citations from the OT, in particular the formula 'as it is written' (in various

⁸⁸ Concerning Paul and Alexandrian methods of Scripture exegesis (in particular that of Philo), Silva makes the observation that "Jews living in the Diaspora were constantly faced by the twin tasks of confronting pagan culture and accommodating to it; survival required learning how neither to compromise their own faith nor to reject Greek thought altogether. This challenge would of course affect their use of Scripture. The very existence of the LXX (a Greek document) is evidence of that fact... The allegorical approach was borrowed by Hellenistic Jewish thinkers, especially in Alexandria. Best known among them was Philo (c. 13 B.C.-A.D. 45), who used this method as a means of synthesizing Hebrew and Greek thought. Whether Paul was familiar with Philo's work is impossible to prove or disprove, but attempts have been made to demonstrate a connection between them" (1993: 635–636). In the end, his conclusion is similar to that of E.E. Ellis (1957) above: "In fact, even a superficial acquaintance with Philo's usual exegetical mode highlights its differences from, rather than similarities to, Pauline hermeneutics. Attempts to find an organic connection between Paul's use of Scripture and Alexandrian exegesis have not been persuasive" (1993: 636).

⁸⁹ E.E. Ellis makes it more emphatic as well: "the importance of Paul's Jewish heritage cannot be ignored if his writings are to be fully understood. The influence of Jewish literary methods particularly and of scriptural interpretations to a lesser degree is frequently apparent. And, where distinguishable, with few exceptions they point to a Palestinian rather than a Hellenistic Judaism; in no case has a direct use of writings of the *diaspora* been established" (1957: 82–83).

constructions)” (1993: 636). Subsequently, the often-employed identification of Paul’s technique as midrashic in nature (among several other ancient *Ioudaios* literary techniques) and bearing resemblance with rabbinic exegesis (see Silva, 1993: 637) has been popular among scholars (see for example Ellis, 1957: 45–53; Silva, 1993: 636–637).

Nonetheless, for Ellis, there still remains a gap (“the great chasm” [1957: 83]) between Paul’s technique and exegesis, and that of his *Ioudaios* background which is filled only by Paul’s Christian encounter. He notes that: “the apostle’s OT exegesis was not just an adoption of current traditions but reveals a vitality and understanding totally foreign to rabbinical literature. If Paul used Jewish interpretations, he culled and moulded (sic) them to a Christological understanding of the OT; if he was a ‘child of his times’, they were for Paul the times of Messiah, His Cross and resurrection, and His revelation of the true meaning of Scripture. Paul was a disciple of Christ not of Gamaliel” (Ellis, 1957: 83). My gleanings from all the deductions by Ellis above (despite the fact that he rightly acknowledges that Paul is not enslaved by his knowledge and use of these *Ioudaios* techniques), wishes to focus on the possible anachronism and error of assigning an early Christian notion and even tagging Paul’s hermeneutics as “Christian hermeneutics” (see Ellis, 1957) as an explanation for Paul’s departure from what might have pertained to his literary context. There are more probable explanations and insights that a literary analysis can provide and that a historical-critical method fails to achieve. Silva (1993), as well, has elaborated on the limitations of uncritically assigning these historical *Ioudaios* methodologies to Paul. His criticism ranges from issues of ascertaining their proper chronology (for example in the case of comparing Paul and rabbinic exegesis), to what he terms “vagueness” with respect to “some of the adduced parallels” (1993: 637–638) such as midrash for example (see also Hays, 1989: 10–14). It is worth summing up the discussions of this section with Hays’ response and recommendation to these challenges:

Rabbinic Judaism, no less than early Christianity, represents (along with the Qumran community and Philo's scholastic Alexandrian Judaism, *inter alia*), one of several different adaptations of the religious and cultural heritage represented by Israel's Scriptures. These different adaptations should be studied, at least initially, as parallel phenomena, related but distinct of that heritage. To argue that one of these phenomena represents a source or influence for another is likely to be misleading unless some documentable lines of historical dependence can be demonstrated. One thing that is clearly documentable is that all of them deliberately regard Scripture as source and authority for their own quite different theological developments. Thus, we are undertaking a valid and necessary (even if preliminary) task when we inquire independently into the way in which any one of them uses scriptural texts (Hays, 1989: 11).⁹⁰

As Hays discusses the subject of hermeneutics more extensively, he arrives at the same conclusions: "our account of Paul's interpretive activity has discovered no systematic exegetical procedures at work in his reading of Scripture... Paul, by contrast, offers helter-skelter intuitive readings, unpredictable, ungeneralizable... He adheres neither to any single exegetical procedure, nor even to a readily specifiable inventory of procedures" (1989: 160). So far in this section, by way of allowing the scholars to speak for themselves, I have cited their observations and conclusions. Most have relied mainly on historical-critical methods such as textual criticism and source criticism to map their way through Paul's use of Scripture. Yet in a majority of their discussions, as demonstrated above, it has been observed that there are limitations and aspects of Paul's Scripture activity that are totally ignored. The next step, then, is to consider a literary methodology that goes beyond the limitations faced by the historical methodologies and also, that takes a broader critical look at Paul's interaction with the Scriptures of Israel, not merely proscribed by direct citations.

⁹⁰ Silva's conclusions are similarly in line with what Hays has settled on: "to be sure the numerous similarities between Paul and the later rabbis, when cumulatively, create the strong presumption that the apostle does reflect the Jewish culture of which he is a part (and which developed into what we call Rabbinic Judaism). The importance of that insight must not be underestimated. Increased familiarity with first-century Jewish interpretation is of inestimable help, at least in a general way, as we seek to appreciate Paul's use of Scripture. Nevertheless, the appeal to later rabbinic literature remains problematic; its evidential value is only indirect, and thus its function is largely limited to illustrative, not probative, uses" (1993: 638).

4.3 Paul's Use of the Scriptures of Israel: A Literary-Rhetorical Methodology vis-à-vis Intertextuality

Paul is, indeed, a man of his first century CE *Ioudaios* and Greco-Roman world in every sense of the description. This has been well-demonstrated above through the historical-critical methods that certain scholars used to discuss his use of the Scriptures of Israel, and more importantly, to demonstrate the veritable viability and versatility of Paul's *Ioudaios* identity. Nonetheless, to reiterate, it is the failure of this methodology (Chapter 3 has explored this in greater depth) to meet the dynamic and unique spectrum of Paul's Scripture use and re-interpretation, that makes it necessary to seek further complementary approaches for understanding Paul, the apostle to the *ethnē*, on his own terms and not on any other crafted through our own anachronistic perceptions of the apostle and/or his writings.

With respect to this study, the historical-critical method, among other factors, fails in three ways: firstly, easily attributing error (whether misquoting, memory lapse or other) to Paul whenever he deviates from what seems to be the norm of his first century CE literary context; and secondly, putting blanket generalized ancient terms over Paul's technique of Scripture use, without critical unique (situation-by-situation or text-by-text) assessment, whenever Paul's literary skills show merely (superficial) similarities with certain first century CE techniques but at a deeper look stand out as unique to him. Thirdly, the historical-critical method unfortunately has often been used to the neglect of interest in exploring themes or tropes that emerge from Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel. Similarly, in a more general approach, John Barton critiques the historical-critical methods and explores its shortfalls (as well as its strengths) but, in its defense, calls on biblical scholars to seek "a true spirit of criticism, for which there is no such thing as ideological purity, only open-mindedness and honesty" (1998: 19).⁹¹ These have contributed partially to the development of two unsolicited

⁹¹ Reference can be made also to the work by John J. Collins who puts up a more positive defense for historical-criticism against its postmodernist opponents (see Collins, 2005: 1–25).

perceptions: firstly, that Paul (and sometimes other New Testament writers) was careless and “unsystematic” with his use of the Scriptures of Israel and secondly, that there is no way in which Paul’s (or for that matter the New Testament writers’) techniques or methodologies can or should be modelled in our contemporary times (see also Silva, 1993: 641–642). This research seeks to refute these misconceptions.

The literary lens through which I wish to discuss Paul’s use (re-interpretation and translation) of the Scriptures of Israel and other *Ioudaios* concepts is the literary model or phenomena known as intertextuality. Ian Mason (2020a) explains intertextuality as: “the reliance of a text on elements of (an)other text(s), whether in the form of actual citation or allusion or in the adoption of formats, styles, genres or discourses that are recognisable within a language and textual culture. All texts depend on other, previous texts, so that intertextuality is seen as a standard of textuality. The term was originally proposed in 1966 by the Bulgarian-French post-structural cultural theorist and feminist Julia Kristeva” (Laver & Mason, 2020a: 71).⁹² In relation to translation studies specifically, he elaborates: “Translation is an intertextual operation – and the term is sometimes used by translation scholars simply to describe relations between source and target texts. However, the handling of socio-textual practices (genres, discourses) in translation requires a richer conception of intertextuality (now often referred to as interdiscursivity), in which consideration of the ability of particular communities (e.g. target-language readers) to access a discourse, genre or text type comes to the fore” (Laver & Mason, 2020a: 71). It must be emphasized that even though as a literary methodology, intertextuality has found varied contemporary applications in literary theory

⁹² Graham Allen has provided a brief historical background to this development: “Intertextuality, like modern literary and cultural theory itself, can be said to have its origins in twentieth-century linguistics, particularly in the seminal work of the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure... The work of the Russian literary theorist M.M. Bakhtin is crucial here... Bakhtin’s theories continually return to inform different theories of intertextuality. Julia Kristeva’s attempt to combine Saussurean and Bakhtinian theories of language and literature produced the first articulation of intertextual theory in the late 1960s... Kristeva’s work on Bakhtin occurred during a transitional period in modern literary and cultural theory. This transition is usually described in terms of a move from structuralism to poststructuralism” (2000: 2–3).

and criticism, the phenomenon of intertextuality has existed and been used among ancient writers and orators as well (see Hays, 1989: 14).

Richard B. Hays (1989) is a significant scholar in the field of New Testament studies to engage with this literary methodology with a more nuanced approach. His departure from and dissatisfaction with the already known historical-critical methods are expressed in the following words:

Through much of the history of Christian theology and biblical interpretation, Paul's innovative readings of Scripture posed no problem because Christians heard the Old Testament through the *translating* headset of a Pauline hermeneutic: what Scripture really meant was whatever Paul (and other New Testament writers) said it meant. Historical criticism, however, has restored a proper sense of Scripture's identity as a separate voice (more properly, a chorus of separate voices, though Paul would not have so understood it) and thus, afforded us the possibility of discerning how Paul plays the rebound of Scripture's voice off his own experience and confession. Such discernment, however, inevitably leads us to hear dissonances between the sacred texts and Paul's rendering of them (1989: 6, emphasis mine).

I describe Hays' approach as nuanced because he himself asserts such a position in setting out the objectives of his research:

The working hypothesis of this book, therefore, is that certain approaches to intertextuality that have developed within literary criticism prove illuminating when applied to Paul's letters...Without denying the value or intrinsic interest of such investigations, I propose instead to discuss the phenomenon of intertextuality in Paul's letters in a more limited sense, focusing on his actual citations of allusions to specific texts. This approach to Paul is both possible and fruitful because Paul repeatedly situates his discourse within the symbolic field created by a single great textual precursor: Israel's Scripture (Hays, 1989: 15).

Hays' methodology, as well as, intertextuality in general (especially when applied in the field of biblical studies) has elicited scholarly criticism, for example from Paul Foster (2015). He agrees with the undergirding theory that the New Testament writers (and texts) demonstrate intertextuality, that is citations, allusions and echoes, as demonstrated by Hays in the case of Paul's letters (see 2015: 96–97). However, Foster critiques the fact that Hays limits his study of intertextuality in Paul's writings only to the Scriptures of Israel and apparently ignores the much larger literary world that might have shaped Paul's writings (see Foster, 2015: 98–99;

cf. Bates, 2012: 263–291).⁹³ Subsequently, his second point of criticism seems to be targeted against intertextuality in general as a literary methodology employed by New Testament scholars (who are most probably drawing inspiration and example from Hays’ pioneering work).⁹⁴ Suggesting that these “Haysian paradigm”⁹⁵ scholarly works are to be regarded rather as speculative, hypothetical and their approaches lacking plausibility (see Foster, 2015: 100, 104, 108), he sums up his verdict as follows: “Admittedly there are monographs that employ Hays’s method to mount more persuasive cases. However, a fundamental concern is that the approach itself appears to lack any control to exclude various implausible intertextual proposals. Surely at a minimum the source text and the text in which the tradition is redeployed should share some significant or extensive verbal parallels, if it is to be claimed that one can identify a case where an author is demonstrably alluding to a tradition from the Jewish scriptures” (Foster, 2015: 109).⁹⁶ Paul Foster’s (2015) criticisms and cautionary suggestions for engaging intertextuality as a literary methodology in New Testament studies will be useful for this research. Graham Allen (2000) has pointed out some important and helpful features about intertextuality as literary methodology and which also interact with Hays’s approach.

⁹³ Matthew W. Bates (2012) raises a similar but more detailed and constructive criticism of Hays. By using Romans 10:16 as a test case, he proposes a diachronic intertextuality approach as more viable and enriching. In defense of Hays, it is important to mention that he did indicate in a footnote that his “working model of intertextuality seeks to incorporate a serious concern for diachronic issues, without making them the center of attention” (1989: 198 n.52).

⁹⁴ On this issue, Foster examines four published scholarly works, while admitting that the four selected are merely “illustrative, rather than comprehensive” (2015: 99) of the criticism he is seeking to make. He indicates that: “the four examples selected for discussion have not been chosen at random; they are designed to illustrate the application of the Haysian method in various sub-collections of New Testament writings – synoptic gospels, Pauline letters and the Petrine epistles. There are several other examples of similar types of studies – so the examples are not the only studies that make these types of interpretive manoeuvres” (2015: 109).

⁹⁵ Expression used by Foster (2015: 104).

⁹⁶ Foster makes further concluding remarks about intertextuality as used by New Testament scholars (not captured here in detail). Generally, he perceives the methodology as portraying some form of radical reader-response approach, along the lines of imposing “Christianized meanings” on the Scriptures of Israel and so accusing the methodology of tending to take a supersessionist approach (see 2015: 109). These remarks are more cautionary than a condemnation of intertextuality as a viable literary methodology for engaging the New Testament’s use of the Scriptures of Israel (see Foster, 2015: 109).

First of all, it is necessary to indicate that this literary methodology will be employed with neither a poststructuralist nor a postmodernist perspective (see Allen, 2000). Secondly, Allen has remarked that: “Intertextuality is one of the most commonly used and misused terms in contemporary critical vocabulary...Intertextuality, one of the central ideas in contemporary literary theory, is not a transparent term and so, despite its confident utilization by many theorists and critics, cannot be evoked in an uncomplicated manner. Such a term is in danger of meaning nothing more than whatever each particular critic wishes it to mean” (Allen, 2000: 1–2; see also McKay, 2013). In this sense, Richard Hays (1989) is quite justified in his nuanced engagement of the methodology,⁹⁷ and this fact reflects positively on the methodology. Finally, Allen (2000) has framed the following important questions that confront all who engage intertextuality as a literary methodology: “Is intertextuality an historically informing term, or is it essentially ahistorical? Does intertextuality open the text to history, or to yet more textuality? Is intertextuality a manageable term, or is it essentially unmanageable, concerned with finite or infinite and overwhelming dimensions of meaning? Does intertextuality provide us with a form of knowledge, or does it destroy what was previously considered to be knowledge? Is the centre of intertextuality in the author, the reader or the text itself? Does intertextuality aid the practice of interpretation, or resist notions of interpretation?” (Allen, 2000: 59). These questions undergird any act of intertextuality and certainly, they will be confronted as 1 Corinthians 15 is discussed. For Allen,

To study intertextuality and intertextual process is to confront these and similar questions, which is perhaps why the term has spawned such a plethora of definitions and redefinitions. Each theorist comes to intertextuality hoping it will provide an informing tool or model for interpretation, but each theorist soon realizes that, as a concept, intertextuality plunges one

⁹⁷ Elsewhere Graham Allen has reiterated this statement with more emphasis: “Intertextuality, as a concept, has a history of different articulations which reflect the distinct historical situations out of which it has emerged. The important task, at least for a study such as this, is not to choose between theorists of intertextuality. It is, rather, to understand that term in its specific historical and cultural manifestations, knowing that any application of it now will itself be an intertextual or transpositional event” (2000: 58–59).

into a series of oppositions and questions. Our task is to engage with it as a split, multiple concept, which poses questions and requires one to engage with them rather than forcing one to produce definite answers (2000: 60).

These facts about intertextuality make it a viable and versatile literary methodology (the success of Hays's investigation is evidential to this) that can stretch and accommodate the breadth of Paul's dynamic use and interaction with the Scriptures of Israel as well as *Ioudaios* concepts in 1 Corinthians 15.

For the purposes of this study, I wish to indicate that I understand Intertextuality to function more as a descriptive methodology and that it avoids the otherwise often prescriptive standards of the historical-critical approaches.⁹⁸ Moreover, intertextuality is ubiquitous, like translation, and holds the potential to bridge the technique or interaction of Paul (and other New Testament writers) with the Scriptures of Israel to our contemporary socio-literary contexts – Africa in this specific case – while avoiding the shortfalls of the typical historical-critical approaches (see Aichele & Phillips, 1995: 8–9).⁹⁹ To iterate, Intertextuality, as a literary-rhetorical methodology, is not a synonym for source criticism or redaction criticism. It's goals and objectives instead lie in engaging primarily with texts as having a voice that demonstrates inter-networks of communication with other texts, rather than simply tracing the origins or sources of current traditions.

⁹⁸ A typical example of such prescriptive attempts and their failure to box in Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel is discussed by Hays as follows: "modern biblical scholars fascinated by the heuristic power of their own conception of exegesis as a rule-governed science have frequently sought to retroject such a conception onto Paul by ascertaining the methods that he employed. Longenecker, for example, classifies Paul's exegesis into four types (literalist, midrashic, pesher, and allegory). However useful such classification can be for certain purposes, it suffers from ex post facto artificiality. Paul did not do his work of interpretation with such analytic categories in mind; the modern concern for methodological control in interpretation is foreign to him" (Hays, 1989: 160, see for full discussion : 160–173).

⁹⁹ Steve Moyise has added his voice to this discussion: "the championing of the historical-critical method as the only valid form of interpretation changed all this. The goal of interpretation during the past two hundred years has been to discover the original intention of each biblical author or editor in his specific historical context. Texts are not to be interpreted in the light of other texts, especially not subsequent texts, but only in their historical context. Meaning is that which the original author intended; hence Old Testament theology becomes a separate discipline from New Testament theology, and both are separated from dogmatic or systematic theology" (2009: 24).

In general, Hays' (1989) work on Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel championed the metaphor of intertextual echo, supplementing the already well-known concepts of direct citation and allusion (see 1989: 21–33). Similarly, in this research, the study of 1 Corinthians 15 will cover not only direct citations, but also intertextual allusions and echoes that come through in the form of *Ioudaios* conceptual ideas and words.

4.4 1 Corinthians 15: Intertextuality and Hermeneutics – Direct Quotations/Citations, Allusions and Echoes from the Scriptures of Israel

In this section, I will briefly discuss three works that have focused on Paul's use of Scripture in 1 Corinthians (specifically Chapter 15) and their bearing on what will proceed in this study in Chapter 5 where I will explore an intertextual analysis of the passage. These three works are J.P. Heil (2005), D.H.H. Williams III (2008) and Ciampa & Rosner (2007).

J.P. Heil's work on 1 Corinthians seeks to "examine the various authoritative roles that not only scriptural quotations but also other explicit references and allusions to scripture play in Paul's rhetorical strategy in his First Letter to the Corinthians" and hence, "to illuminate the powerful impact that the Jewish scriptures exert on Paul's implied audience at Corinth" (2005: 2). Also, his work aims to affirm, among other things, the fact that "Paul also utilized distinctively Jewish rhetorical devices and techniques in his Septuagintal use of the Old Testament" (Heil, 2005: 4–5). These aims and objectives align partly with the goal of this research. However, Heil (2005) limits his study to only direct citations and allusions, and does not consider the possibility of the presence of intertextual echoes within the text in 1 Corinthians, and for that matter in the Chapter 15.¹⁰⁰ Further, his goal of demonstrating "Paul's use and adaptation of Jewish exegetical techniques, such as *gezera shava*, *kal va-*

¹⁰⁰ For 1 Corinthians 15, Heil (2005) identifies six (that is if vs. 54b-55 are counted separately but five if they are combined) Scripture citations and allusions: 15:25, 27, 32b, 45a and 54b-55 (see Heil, 2005: viii, 205–260).

homer, peshar, and targumic methods” (2005: 5), which are ancient Judean exegetical methods, tend to delimit his literary methodology from exploring how unique Paul was in his use of the Scriptures of Israel. In a sense, such an approach still ties his methodology to the limitations of the historical-critical approaches discussed above. Finally, his work has no bearing on translation studies, an important contribution this research work seeks to make.

Another work following this pattern is the article by D.H.H. Williams III titled “Light Giving Sources: Examining the Extent of Scriptural Citation and Allusion Influence in 1 Corinthians,” in which he attempts to “crystallize the influence of Paul’s Jewish background in 1 Corinthians” (Williams III, 2008: 8) by studying “agreed upon Jewish influence within 1 Corinthians in the form of citations and allusions” (2008: 8). Therefore, once again like John Paul Heil (2005), he has also limited his study to citations and allusions.¹⁰¹ Similarly, he also identified six citations and allusions in 1 Corinthians 15 as follows: 15:25, 27, 32, 45, 54 and 55. Hence, similarly, the criticism raised about Heil’s work also applies to Williams III (2008).

Two publications worth mentioning in passing are E.E. Ellis (1957) and Moisés Silva (1993) both of which were briefly referenced above. With respect to 1 Corinthians 15, both works list what they identify as citations and allusions to Scripture in the text. Additionally, they have marked out where there are agreements (=) or variations (≠) between Paul and the LXX and the Masoretic Text (subsequently, MT). I have tabulated and modified these below for presentation purposes:

Table 4.4.1 - E.E. Ellis (1957) - this is a modified extract from two comprehensive tables titled; “Quotations in the Pauline Epistles” and “OT Allusions and Parallels in the Pauline Epistles” (see Ellis, 1957: 150–154).

¹⁰¹ Williams III (2008) gives a reason for this approach as follows: “due to space considerations, the investigation of echoes and themes cannot be considered. The certainty of these is less agreed upon than the citations and allusions” (2008: 8 n.4).

PAUL		LXX	MT	CITED TEXT	LXX=MT	LXX≠MT
1 Corinthians	15v.27*	≠	≠		✓	
	15v.32	=	≠			
	15v.45	≠	≠		✓	
	15v.54	≠	≠			✓
	15v.55	≠	≠			✓
	15v.25	ALLUSION				

KEY: *For Ellis, this represents a verse where “there is only a slight variation from the LXX.” (1957: 150). = represents agrees with; ≠ represents variation; and a tick represents cases where the LXX and MT may agree or disagree.

Table 4.4.2 – Silva (1993)

PAUL		LXX	MT
1 Corinthians	15v.25	DEBATED	
	15v.27	=	=
	15v.32	=	=
	15v.45	=	=
	15v.54	≠	≠
	15v.55	≠	≠

KEY: = represents agrees with; ≠ represents variation.

Firstly, Ellis does not include 15v.25 in his list of citations but includes it under allusions, whilst Silva places it under a “debated” list (see Ellis, 1957: 152; Silva, 1993: 631). Secondly, Silva has indicated that his data, “based primarily on the work of Michel, Ellis and Koch, are meant to be as inclusive as possible: if two of these scholars agree on a reference, that reference is included” (1993: 630). Further, Silva asserts the need to consider the gray

areas involved in drawing such lines of agreements or variations with the LXX or MT (or both), since some of the times such clear lines do not exist (see Silva, 1993: 632). His table does not pay direct attention to whether the LXX and MT are in variation or agreement in any instances. A comparison of both tables shows that both scholars have differing views on how Paul's cited or alluded-to text relates to their respective LXX and/or MT "sources."

The final work to be looked at under this section was done under the editorship of Carson & Beale (2007) titled *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Generally, this publication differs from those mentioned above, specifically in the fact that they considered not just citations and allusions but also possible echoes within the texts. In their chapter on 1 Corinthians Ciampa & Rosner (2007) identify the usual five direct citations: 15v.27, 32, 45, 54 and 55; they also identify v.25 as an allusion; and the following as echoes: vs.3-4, 14-18, 20, 21-22, 30, 36, and 56 (see Ciampa & Rosner, 2007: 743–748). Even though their work pays more attention to direct citations, discussing them under six subthemes – NT context, its OT context, in Early Judaism, Textual Matters, the use of the cited text in its NT context and finally, Theological Use. They do not expound more on the echoes (see Ciampa & Rosner, 2007: 743–748). As far as this research is concerned, their contribution lacked the discussion on translation studies and as well, the context of African readers. In the Chapter 6 this research work will seek to make a contribution in this respect.

These three briefly reviewed publications already indicate that discussions on Paul's use of Scripture have come a long way. Nonetheless, these have been done primarily for hermeneutical purposes and also, for and from "Western" academic contexts, as universal as some of their axiomatic extractions may be. The question still remains whether these issues have any bearing on the ever-growing field of (Bible) translation studies (in and for Africa) and for that matter, whether the hermeneutical concerns can be explored specifically and for the benefit of African audiences.

4.5 (Bible) Translation (Studies) and Intertextuality: An African Case Study

Paul's use of Scripture and concepts from his ethnocultural heritage are always burdened or earmarked by or with interpretation and for that matter, translation (see Ciampa, 2012). This is a fact in as much as his letters are addressed to communities who were no longer the firsthand recipient audience of those citations (and allusions); also, they represented even different literary and cultural milieux. Ciampa, mentioned briefly in Chapter 2, has argued that "we may consider Paul's overall engagement with Scripture (in direct and indirect quotes, allusions, echoes, use of concepts and ideas, etc.) to function as a type of indirect translation rather than direct translation" (2012b: 304). Indirect translation can be described as "one that that (sic) only partially resembles the original text and its meaning, retaining only those parts that are relevant to those to whom his interpretation is being transmitted" (Ciampa, 2012b: 305) and so "aspires not to complete interpretive resemblance to the original but only to partial resemblance, with alterations made in order to adapt the text in ways that optimize its relevance for the receptors" (2012b: 303–304). In another instance, Ciampa (2012b) has affirmed the following as a driving motive for this approach on the part of Paul: "in Paul's understanding, God expects him (and his readers need him) to "translate" the message of the gospel so that Gentiles can understand how they also fit into God's plans and how they can (literally and metaphorically) sit at the same table with Jewish believers as they follow Christ in their own cities and culture" (2012b: 307–308).

As a literary methodology and with all its broad potential (see Aichele & Phillips, 1995), intertextuality has not always been received well when applied in New Testament studies, so some challenges could be anticipated when applying its principles for translation purposes. G.K. Beale (2012) has expressed the opinion that "it is not unusual in the field of biblical

studies today to hear the word *intertextuality* used to refer to how later parts of Scripture refer to earlier parts... The term ‘intertextuality,’ however, is fuzzy” (2012: 39, italics in original). He has further elaborated that the term may also “refer to the procedure by which a later biblical text refers to an earlier text, how that earlier text enhances the meaning of the later one, and how the later one creatively develops the earlier meaning. In this respect, ‘intertextuality’ may be seen as a procedure of inner-biblical or intrabiblical exegesis, which is crucial to doing biblical theology and for understanding the relation of the OT to the NT” (2012: 40).¹⁰² Certainly, the methodology of intertextuality can be used beyond these purposes or of being considered as merely an intra-biblical exercise (see Beale, 2012: 40).¹⁰³ On the accusation of ambiguity that confronts the use of intertextuality in the field of biblical studies Hays et al., (2009) comments as follows: “for some biblical scholars intertextuality has provided a catchy new way to describe the sort of work they were already doing on sources and backgrounds of biblical texts or on *Traditionsgeschichte*. Such interpreters have developed the idea of intertextuality in a strongly historical way, as an approach to tracing lines of influence and development” (2009: xiii, italics in original). Evidently, this is a sidetracking if such scholars treat intertextuality as another methodology in the practice of source criticism (see Aichele & Phillips, 1995: 11–12). In Chapter 5, the discussion of

¹⁰² In this study, the analysis and discussions that will be done in Chapter 5 follow a text-centred approach. As I have carefully argued, my choice of this literary methodology is not a radical break from other useful methods of reading Scripture. Whatever each method produces must go toward benefiting and enriching the academic enterprise. W. Randolph Tate writes: “that the locus of meaning is not to be found exclusively in either world or in a marriage of any two of the worlds, but in the interplay between all three worlds. Meaning resides in the conversation between the text and reader with the world behind the text informing that conversation. Interpretation is impaired when any world is given preeminence at the expense of neglecting the other two” (2008: 7).

¹⁰³ A discussion about intertextuality can do with a mention of interdiscursivity, another literary theory that is evolving alongside and often discussed interchangeably with intertextuality (see Agha, 2005; Bartesaghi & Noy, 2015; Bullo, 2017; Laver & Mason, 2020a). Interdiscursivity is described as “the incorporation into a text of genres, discourses or textual formats that are available in the language and culture in which it is composed. Readers engage with the text through their recognition of these previously encountered conventions and the particular way in which they are worked together in the text under scrutiny. Among issues for translators are the extent to which particular genres are available in a target language, how they function within the target culture and the gradual imposition on other languages and cultures of dominant genres” (Laver & Mason, 2020b).

citations, allusions and intertextual echoes expressed through *Ioudaios* concepts and expressions in 1 Corinthians 15 will not be framed in this perspective. Hays describes a more guided literary use of intertextuality as follows:

The appeal of ‘intertextuality’ was that it provided a way of discerning literary, thematic, and theological linkages within the biblical canon without having to make any historical arguments about processes of transmission or events ‘behind’ the texts and without having to address issues of extratextual reference. The project of discerning intracanonial echoes, then, has provided an easy methodological justification for the long-established Christian interpretive strategy of reading the canon synchronically as a witness to the gospel and of discovering a literary continuity within the diversity of the biblical texts (2009: xiii).

Bible Interpretation and Translation in Africa needs to witness and appropriate this literary continuity.¹⁰⁴

Finally, on intertextuality, both Richard B. Hays (1989) and Steve Moyise (2009) have reviewed Green’s (1982) *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* and discussed the possibility of adapting “an analytic framework” (Hays, 1989: 173) from Greene’s “analysis of imitation in Renaissance poetry” (Moyise, 2009: 26) which will enable biblical scholars to “render a synoptic characterization of the overall relation between Scripture and Paul’s reading of it” (Hays, 1989: 173). Hays’s presentation of these four categories are:

1. *Sacramental imitation*. (Or “reproductive imitation.”) The poem venerates a precursor by imitating it with slavish precision.
2. *Eclectic imitation*. (Or “exploitative imitation.”) The poem mingles allusions to various texts and traditions, without binding itself in a determinative fashion to any one subtext.
3. *Heuristic imitation*. The poem “singles out one text as its putative genesis and it defines itself through its rewriting... The poem becomes a kind of *rite de passage* between a specified past and an emergent present.” The result of this strategy is that heuristic imitations “*distance themselves* from the subtexts and force us to recognize the poetic distance traversed.”
4. *Dialectical Imitation*. The poem engages the precursor in such a way that two symbolic worlds are brought into collision so that each is vulnerable to criticism and interpretation by the other... if the poem succeeds, it presumably achieves a synthesis of the two worlds, but the genius of dialectical imitation is to produce the

¹⁰⁴ For the field of translation studies, interdiscursivity has also developed alongside intertextuality, based on the description that “the handling of socio-textual practices (genres, discourses) in translation requires a richer conception of intertextuality (now often referred to as interdiscursivity), in which consideration of the ability of particular communities (e.g. target-language readers) to access a discourse, genre or text type comes to the fore” (Laver & Mason, 2020a).

synthesis within the text of a literary work that *sustains* the tension between worlds rather than resolving it (Hays, 1989: 173–174, italics are in the original).

Related to the use or imitation of Scripture by the New Testament writers, both Hays (1989) and Moyise (2009) discuss that it is the latter two that share affinities with their technique (see Moyise, 2009: 23–24). For Hays, in the case of Paul, “only Galatians can justly be described as an instance of heuristic intertextual reading” (1989: 176). Nonetheless, he is optimistic that “Paul’s fundamental reading strategies are profoundly *dialectical*. The word of Scripture is not played off as a foil for the gospel, not patronized as a primitive stage of religious development, not regarded merely as a shadow of the good things to come. Paul’s urgent hermeneutical project, rather, is to bring Scripture and gospel into a mutually interpretive relation, in which the righteousness of God is truly disclosed” (Hays, 1989: 176, italics in original).¹⁰⁵

Concerning dialectical imitation, Hays (1999) has re-affirmed his assertion in a different publication where he discussed the theme of apocalyptic eschatology and Scripture in 1 Corinthians: “because Paul and his readers stand at the turn of the ages, they must envision their present experience both as the fulfillment of the scriptural figures and, at the same time as a hint of the eschatological consummation that is still to come. Thus, Paul’s reading of Scripture is ‘bifocal,’ corresponding to the dialectical (‘already/not yet’) character of his eschatology” (Hays, 1999: 401).

In all, what has been inferred about intertextuality and Paul’s reading and use of the Scriptures of Israel, is that intertextuality is a literary methodology that this research can tap into while sustaining Paul’s *Ioudaios* nested identity. Furthermore, through intertextuality we can hold in tandem the nested identities of Paul’s Gentiles-in-Christ audiences to whom he

¹⁰⁵ See Hays (1989: 176–178) for his analysis and discussion of these assertions.

wrote while engaging with the concepts and Scriptures of Israel via mainly a dialectical mode of imitation.

My *modus operandi* and intertextual discussion of 1 Corinthians 15 on Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel and *Ioudaios* conceptual ideas will also focus on the activity of Scripture translation and intertextuality with the African multifaceted context in view (see Chapter 6 as well). In translation activity, it is common that closer attention is paid to translating direct citations and perhaps to some little extent, allusions. Nonetheless, this research seeks to make a case that Paul's use of Scripture and *Ioudaios* conceptual ideas must not just be identified but must also be followed through to the extent of being translated in such a way as to reflect that intertextual rhetorical effect. Further to the above, the rhetorical effect that Paul created through his intertextual use of these *Ioudaios* concepts and echoes should not be lost in translation. These raise the important question of whether Paul (or the New Testament writers) and their citation or use of Scriptures can become viable role models for us today, focusing on translation activity. Hays (1989) has made some recommendations on this issue under the caption "Paul's letters as hermeneutical model" (see Hays, 1989: 178–192). This issue will be revisited in Chapter 6 of this research in the light of Scripture reading and translation activity for Africa's multifaceted contexts.

4.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has emphasized the relevance of literary methodologies for exploring Paul's literary world and specifically, his *Ioudaios* literary world in his use of Scripture. Once again, the historical-critical approaches that have been popularized over the decades must be complemented with literary approaches such as intertextuality which opens up more dimensions for exploring Paul's versatility and conscious activity of not only

interpreting but also, translating the text of Scripture. The next chapter will seek to study the intertextual literary paths along which Paul communicated the claims of the Gospel of the resurrection of Jesus Christ in 1 Corinthians 15.

CHAPTER 5

5.0 An Intertextual Approach to the Rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15

5.1 Introduction

This chapter forms the culmination of the main purpose of the research. The previous chapters have discussed the *Ioudaios* identity of Paul (Chapter 2), the context of 1 Corinthians and its recipient implied audience (Chapter 3) and also, a survey of the ancient techniques we can deduce from Paul's use and reading of the Scriptures of Israel (Chapter 4). Through these chapters and culminating in this current chapter, a literary methodology is advocated, as against the more commonly used historical-critical methodologies, to examine new evidence and enriching discoveries that other methodologies often fail to uncover or overlook. All these have helped to set the stage for the literary methodology, intertextuality, that is used in this chapter to analyze the rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15. Also, in Chapter 1 of this study, I have outlined four reasons that undergird my study and choice of this particular chapter of 1 Corinthians.

In this chapter, the aim is to search out the *Ioudaios* concepts and related words or expressions and use of Scripture that Paul employs skillfully for the purposes of his rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 15 and to discuss why and how these discoveries need attention for translation purposes.

5.2 1 Corinthians 15 – What is at Stake?

In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul comes to the question about the resurrection of the dead as well as the eschatological fate of the living. Firstly, the conversation about the status of human life after death is a cross-cultural metaphysical subject. Hellenists, Romans, *Ioudaioi* and various

people-groups in the ancient Mediterranean world held on to one or several understandings of this subject. In fact, the better-known Hellenistic philosophical groups – Stoics, Cynics, and Epicureans – all espoused varying positions on the topic of what happens when people die, but basically, they did not express belief in a bodily resurrection. In his work *Surprised By Hope: Rethinking Heaven, the Resurrection, and the Mission of the Church* (2008), N.T. Wright paid attention to these ancient perspectives, indicating that even among Paul’s own *Ioudaios* background there were groups like the Sadducees who did not believe in any form of resurrection from the dead. These were the few exceptions, like also “others [who] agreed with those pagans who thought in terms of a glorious though disembodied future for the soul. Here the obvious example is the philosopher Philo” (Wright, 2008: 37, word in bracket mine). But in general, “most Jews of the day believed in an eventual resurrection—that is, that God would look after the soul after death until, at the last day, God would give his people new bodies when he judged and remade the whole world” (Wright, 2008: 37). It is observable that the terrain on this subject was not homogeneous. Paul might have anticipated these barriers when he preached the Gospel to his multifaceted Corinthian community of believers. Nonetheless, the issue still came up as one of the controversial matters dividing the community of believers and needed to be addressed again.

The situation of Paul’s community of Jesus-followers in Corinth as a multifaceted audience was discussed in Chapter 3 of this work and much of what has been iterated continues to apply at this stage of the letter as well. Nonetheless, a specific discussion to highlight what lies ahead of this intertextual analysis and justifies this methodology would be helpful. The point has been made that “in 1 Cor, we find Paul calling his readers and hearers to a *conversion of the imagination*” (Hays, 1999: 395, italics in original). The message of the cross and the good news of the resurrection are the primary defining moments around which Paul shapes his focus for the identity formation of his community of believers (see Hays,

1999). And as a hermeneutical activity, Paul summons the texts and traditions of Israel as the paradigm of what the God of Israel had done and as significant to deciphering what He (God) has declared to do next in the light of the event of the cross and the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. That which must be continually noted is that Paul “repeatedly draws upon eschatologically interpreted Scripture texts to clarify the identity of the church and to remake the minds of his congregations” (Hays, 1999: 395). This *conversion of the imagination* and the use of texts and traditions of Israel reconfigured through the message of the cross and the resurrection, become real in this Chapter 15 of 1 Corinthians (see Hays, 1999).

Among many other factors and reasons (some of which have been explored in the previous chapter), such eschatological reading and use of the Scriptures of Israel (among other texts and traditions) are what makes intertextuality a relevant tool to biblical studies and exegesis (see Moyise, 2002). In the discussion and analysis below, the research identifies direct citations to the Scriptures of Israel, allusions and (intertextual) echoes. And as a unique and deeper step further, the research identifies Paul engaging with certain nouns and verbs, through their intertextual network of which the Scriptures and traditions of Israel were a crucial part, in a pivotal manner, so that they contribute to what has been tagged in this study as *Ioudaios* concepts.

In some cases, the evidence of the presence and the rhetorical function of these concepts seems subtle and in other cases, they are visible and acknowledged equally by other scholars interested in this methodology for the purposes of literary analysis. The outcomes of this study affirm that all these elements are integral to Paul’s rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 15. Finally, it would be observed below, that ancient texts such as the LXX and the MT renderings of the Scriptures of Israel will be considered as possible intertexts for Paul’s citations, allusions, intertextual echoes and *Ioudaios* concepts. Once again, I use the term “intertexts” in order to honour the principle that even though I explore these texts as part of the intertextual

approach, they are in no way being engaged as source texts as Source Critical or Redaction scholars from the historical-critical methodology would approach them. By inference, I am working with the framework that the definition of Paul's *Ioudaios* ethnocultural identity (see Chapter 2) invokes such intertexts. Consequently, because these are the intertexts for contemporary African readers, scholars, and translators of the Scriptures as well, the research work seeks to address this mutual literary environment and hence it becomes a necessity to view with these texts not as source criticism but as textual families and intertexts. Chapter 4 of this study has already discussed and indicated the position of this research on Paul's possible engagement with these texts (whether as oral or written). Nonetheless, to reiterate, I assume in this study (for the worth of any historical interest) and in this chapter that Paul had access to a version of the LXX (a version most likely lost to us today), and used it rather than a version of the text in Hebrew, although it is not impossible that he was familiar with the latter too, and that differences between the LXX and Paul's quotations reflect first century CE, *Ioudaios* style of engaging with texts, which did not rule out adjustments for the sake of rhetorical emphasis, contextualization and readability. The verdict is that what Paul is doing here is his particular – and strange for us – engagement with the LXX, was crucially typical for *Ioudaios* “exegesis”.

5.3 Intertextual Analysis of the Rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15¹⁰⁶

5.3.1 Verses 1-5:

¹ Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐστήκατε,
² δι' οὗ καὶ σώζεσθε, τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν εἰ κατέχετε, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῆ ἐπιστεύσατε.

¹⁰⁶ All Greek texts are from Nestle-Aland 28th edition.

³ παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν
 ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς
⁴ καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς
⁵ καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾶ εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα·

5.3.1.1 Intertextual Analysis

These opening statements (verse 1-2) follow immediately from the concluding instructions on the matters concerning propriety during worship (Chapters 8 to 14). It seems Paul has saved this matter on the resurrection among the last issues, and probably for him, requiring the most important attention. Paul's use of δέ, a continuative conjunction, in the opening of what has become for us, Chapter 15 of his letter, already heralds in a sense of urgency on what he is about to discuss.¹⁰⁷ This is in no way undermining the importance of all the previous matters he has addressed; however, as will be seen later below, Paul regards this particular matter of the resurrection as the central issue that must not be compromised lest everything else falls apart. Wright affirms this: “the hope of resurrection underlies the whole of 1 Corinthians, not just chapter 15. But here Paul addresses it head-on as of central importance” (Wright, 2008: 155).

In verse 3 again, the dative adjective πρώτοις stresses the importance of this subject to Paul. And Paul adds the burden of his proof in the statement παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν...ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον, (*lit.* For I handed down to you...that which I received). The term παρέδωκα used here is a direct attribution to “tradition”, functioning as an intertextual echo to the manner in which traditions and the Scriptures of Israel are entrusted from one generation to the next. Through this term Paul is preparing the ground for the importance of what he is about to communicate in this pericope. These words of verse 3-5 or sometimes verse 3-7 have generally been regarded as an early (oral or written) tradition and testimony to the

¹⁰⁷ Steven E. Runge hints at this when he indicates that “the use of δέ represents the writer's choice to explicitly signal that what follows is a new, distinct development in the story or argument, based on how the writer conceived of it” (Runge, 2010: 31).

resurrection of Christ. Such an oral tradition is quite possible and lends further support for a *Ioudaios* intertextual context at work.¹⁰⁸ Hays has commented on the literary structure of this early confession in verse 3b-5: “the confession itself consists of four clauses. The first and third are the fundamental faith affirmations, while the second and fourth fill out the story of Christ’s death and resurrection and provide supporting warrants for the fundamental claims in the other two clauses” (1997: 255).

For the purposes of the proceeding discussion, verse 3-5 is captured below -

ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς
καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη
καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς
καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾶ εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα·

It is not simple to determine whether the confession ends in verse 4 or in verse 5 or even verse 7 as some scholars have suggested. Clearly, this is the first of many instances to come, where we witness Paul drawing on his *Ioudaios* background vis-à-vis the Scriptures of Israel. No one knows the exact direct source of this confession. Furthermore, there are several instances of intertextuality at work within the tradition, which not all scholars recognise. For example, Ciampa & Rosner infer the following: “Paul asserts that the death and resurrection of Christ, the central events of his gospel (15:2), are *kata tas graphas* (‘in accordance with the Scriptures’). That Paul refers to ‘the Scriptures’ in the plural only rarely (Rom. 1:2; 15:4; 16:26; 1 Cor. 15:3–4; cf. Gal. 3:10) suggests that here he is speaking generally; the many references to ‘Scripture’ in the singular are used routinely when citing a specific text” (2007: 744, italics in original). Nonetheless, it is also possible for scholars to map out what seems to hint at specific intertextuality in the confession. For example, some scholarly works have

¹⁰⁸ Craig Keener has shared the following concerning the expression *παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν...ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον*: “is the language of what scholars call “traditioning”: Jewish teachers would pass on their teachings to their students, who would in turn pass them on to their own students. The students could take notes, but they delighted especially in oral memorization and became quite skilled at it; memorization was a central feature of ancient education. In the first generation, the tradition would be very accurate; some even believe that this tradition would be very accurate; some even believe that this tradition in 15:3-5 or 15:3-7 may be a verbatim citation” (2014: 491).

pointed out the intertextual echo in the phrase ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν from Isaiah 53:5-6, 11-12, also, allusions to Psalms 8 and 110 which occur in 1 Corinthians 15:24-28 and the phrase τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ as references to Hosea 6:2 and Jonah 1:17 (Malina & Pilch, 2006: 123; see Ciampa & Rosner, 2007: 744).

Hays (1997) has long discussed these intertextual links as well (see 1997: 256). Further to this, based on a review of an intertextual similarity between verse 4 and 1 Maccabees 7:16: καὶ ἐνεπίστευσαν αὐτῷ καὶ συνέλαβεν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐξήκοντα ἄνδρας καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτοὺς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ κατὰ τὸν λόγον ὃν ἔγραψεν αὐτόν (BGT), Hays (1997: 256) comments that “the phrase ‘according to the Scriptures’ modifies the verb “was raised” rather than the temporal reference to third” (see also Ciampa & Rosner, 2007: 744). This position is also affirmed by Lukaszewski, et al. who assert that “the word ἐγήγερται is modified by κατὰ (preposition) in 1Co 15:4... (κατὰ is within the current clausal unit, after ἐγήγερται)” (Lukaszewski, Dubis & Blakley, 2011, 1 Cor. 15:4). Based on this intertextual similarity (with 1 Maccabees 7:16), Hays rightly asserts that “we could translate the clause as follows: ‘and that he was raised in accordance with the Scriptures, on the third day’” (Hays, 1997: 256). This kind of emphasis brings to the fore the Scriptural intertextual context within which Paul and the confession (or the tradition he is relying on) is operating. Along these lines, Hays asserts that “in that case, the Scriptures that point to the resurrection are probably those Psalms that praise God for deliverance of the righteous sufferer” (1997: 256). Evidently, “there are several indications in Paul’s letters that the Psalms were understood at a very early date as spoken by or referring to the Messiah (=Christ) ... This is the primary context in which the references to the Scriptures in 1 Corinthians 15:3-4 should be understood” (Hays, 1997: 256). The table I present below displays the texts of Isaiah 53:5-6 and Hosea 6:2 which provide allusions or possible intertextual echoes to 1 Corinthians 15:3-4:

Table 5.3.1.1 – Allusion/Echo 1 Corinthians 15:3b-4a

1 Corinthians 15	Allusion/Echo	
	MT	LXX
Verse 3b ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς	Isaiah 53:5-6 BHS וְהוּא מְחֻלָּל מִפְשָׁעֵינוּ מִדַּבְּרָא מְעוֹנָתֵינוּ מוֹסֵר שְׁלוֹמֵנוּ עָלָיו וּבְחִבְרָתוֹ גִּרְפָּא־לָנוּ: כְּלָנוּ כְּצֵאן תְּלֵינוּ אִישׁ לְדַרְכּוֹ פְּגָנוּ וַיְהִי הַפְּגִיעַ בּוֹ אֵת עֶזְרָן כְּלָנוּ:	Isaiah 53:5-6 LXT αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν παιδεία εἰρήνης ἡμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτόν τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ιάθημεν πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν ἄνθρωπος τῆ ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπλανήθη καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτόν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν
Verse 4a καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται	Psalms 16:9b-10 BHS אֲרֹא-בָּשָׁרִי יִשְׁכַּן לְבַטָּח: כִּי לֹא-תַעֲזָב נַפְשִׁי לְשָׂאוֹל לֹא-תַתֵּן וַיְהִי הַפְּגִיעַ בּוֹ אֵת עֶזְרָן כְּלָנוּ:	Psalms 15:9b-10 LXT δὲ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἄδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν
	Hosea 6:2 BHS וַיִּגְנוּ מִיַּמַּיִם בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי יִקְמְנוּ וַנִּחְיֶה לְפָנָיו:	Hosea 6:2 LXT ὕγιασει ἡμᾶς μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστήσομεθα καὶ ζησόμεθα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ

Looking back at the translation issue discussed above, the majority of English translations follow the traditional rendering similar to this structure: “and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures” (1 Cor. 15:4, NET).¹⁰⁹ The French NBS shows a similar structure: “Il a été enseveli, il s’est réveillé le troisième jour, selon les Ecritures” (1 Cor.15:4); The Ga Bible, a mother-tongue Bible in Ghana, has similar rendering as “ni afu le, ni atee le shi ekoṇṇ ye gbi ni ji etē le nɔ ye ŋmalei le anaa” (NEGAB).

¹⁰⁹ CSB, ESV, KJV, NAS, NIV, NRS, and TNIV all keep to this structure of rendering 1 Corinthians 15:4.

As much as these translations are not in error in their rendering of the text, it nonetheless goes to indicate that a translation that is conscious of the *Ioudaios* intertextual context of Paul's discussion in this chapter will consider the option employed by, for example, the NJB: "and that he was buried; and that *on the third day*, he was raised to life, *in accordance with the Scriptures*" (1 Cor. 15:4 NJB, emphasis mine). Similarly, also, by the *Parole de Vie* as well: "On l'a mis au tombeau, et le troisième jour, Dieu l'a réveillé de la mort, comme les Livres Saints l'avaient annoncé." In Ghana, the Asante-Twi with Deuterocanonical Bible (ASWDC) version follows this alternative rendering as well: "Na wosiee no, na ne nnansa soo no wonyanee no, sedefe twere nsem no ka no" (ASWDC). The intertextual function of these alternative renderings is that, by positioning the translation of *καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται* closer to *κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς*, focus is given to the intertextual interplay between the Scriptures (*κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς*) and the function of the verb *ἐγήγερται*. The reader's attention is drawn to this intertextual connection.

Still in this pericope, it is important to account for how often Paul has used the verb *ἐγήγερται* (in the rest of Chapter 15 as well) and not primarily the direct Hellenistic noun for resurrection, *ἀνάστασις*. It is apparent that the verb *ἐγήγερται* is embedded with *Ioudaios* connotations. In its cognate forms the verb is used nineteen times by Paul throughout this chapter. This makes the verb more than just an ordinary word, but rather one that deserves to be explored further as a technical term from a *Ioudaios* perspective. For example, Bruce Malina & John Pilch (2006) have shared that: "the Greek term for Jesus being raised (*egeiro*) was the ordinary word for "getting up" or "being lifted up." It is invested with special theological meaning in the Israelite social system, first of all by its being used in the passive voice... Secondly, the word was invested with the specific cultural meaning of being raised by the God of Israel from the dead" (2006: 124). It seems crucial to the authors of the Scriptures of Israel, especially during the intertestamental era and in the writings of the

apocrypha to embed ἐγείρω with the concepts that differentiated between the primarily Hellenistic concept of immaterial resurrection versus the *Ioudaios* understanding of a bodily raising done by the God of Israel (see discussion in Oepke, 1964a: 369–372). There is some indication that the NT writers, Paul included, tended to prefer this term to other more used Hellenistic terms and their variants used for the resurrection, for two reasons: firstly, the Scriptures of Israel and its LXX renderings of the expression ἐγείρω helped create the intertextuality in their writings, further setting them apart from neighbouring literary writings on the subject and secondly, these *Ioudaios* authors are able to avoid constant ambiguity such as what happened to Paul in Athens according to Luke’s report, when the listeners confused Paul’s speech about Jesus and the resurrection with two possibly different deities (see Acts 17:18).¹¹⁰ Another aspect of these two reasons has been expressed by A. Oepke that “if, in distinction from Hellenism... the NT prefers ἐγείρειν and ἐγείρεσθαι to ἀνίστάναι and ἀνίστασθαι (though not, of course, ἔγερσις to ἀνάστασις), this is perhaps because it brings out better the concrete nature of the divine action” (1964b: 335).

In the table above, for the LXT Hosea 6:2 allusion, the verb ἀναστησόμεθα is used. It is interesting, then, that in the confession (verse 3-5) we rather find a cognate of ἐγείρω used. The fact that Paul continues to use this metaphor for nineteen times in this chapter alone is an example of his conscious activity of engaging with the Scriptures of Israel and *Ioudaios* concepts. Therefore, given its usage and intertextual web of resonance, this verb can be identified as a *Ioudaios* concept which Paul carries over in translation to effectively communicate to his multifaceted audiences.

5.3.2 Verses 6-11:

¹¹⁰ Oepke has similarly observed that “in Ac. 17:18 ἀνάστασις seems to be misunderstood by the hearers as a proper name” (1964a: 369).

⁶ ἔπειτα ὄφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ, ἐξ ὧν οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν ἕως ἄρτι, τινὲς δὲ ἐκοιμήθησαν·

⁷ ἔπειτα ὄφθη Ἰακώβω εἶτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν·

⁸ ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡσπερὶ τῷ ἐκτρόματι ὄφθη κάμοι.

⁹ Ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων ὃς οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος, διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ·

¹⁰ χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμι ὅ εἰμι, καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἡ εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ κενὴ ἐγενήθη, ἀλλὰ περισσότερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκοπίασα, οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ [ἡ] σὺν ἐμοί.

¹¹ εἴτε οὖν ἐγὼ εἴτε ἐκεῖνοι, οὕτως κηρύσσομεν καὶ οὕτως ἐπιστεύσατε.

5.3.2.1 Intertextual Analysis

Beyond alluding to the evidence of a confession or creed concerning the resurrection of Christ, Paul now points to the evidence of Christ's appearances to certain people, acknowledging them as eyewitnesses. Again, there is an option, of joining verse 5 above to this particular pericope for discussion purposes. By moving on to the testimony of eyewitnesses, Paul is building strong evidence, beginning from the testimony of a sacred confession or oral creed, to the present and tangible witness of persons ἐξ ὧν οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν ἕως ἄρτι, τινὲς δὲ ἐκοιμήθησαν.

At this point, it is important to examine the passive verb ὄφθη which Paul uses specifically four times (including in verse 5) in this pericope to define these divine appearances. The Greek or Hellenistic vocabulary and for that matter both the Scriptures of Israel (vis-à-vis the LXX) and the New Testament are loaded with different words and verbs that signify various activities or events related to the function of the eye or sight (see discussion Michaelis, 1964: 315–366). There is evidence that Paul's use of ὄφθη serves as a technical term, probably hinting at a *Ioudaios* concept, and signaling more than just the event of the eyes of these witnesses seeing the risen Lord. This is because such a surface claim and understanding of ὄφθη does not buttress Paul's central case for a bodily resurrection. And this is where an intertextual analysis becomes valuable, especially when we perceive the manner in which the Gospel writers and Acts for example have used the verbal forms of ὁράω specifically in

relation to their post-resurrection appearances narratives (see discussion Michaelis, 1964: 355–361). Paul’s use of the creed and subsequently, his use of ὄφθη, aorist passive 3rd person singular of the verb ὁράω, demonstrates the intertextuality that exists among his writings, that of the Gospel writers, Acts and stretching into the Scriptures of Israel.¹¹¹ Further to the discussion, and more specifically, in the case of ὄφθη, its occurrences in the New Testament are found in Mathew 17:3; Mark 9:4; Luke 1:11, 22:43, 24:34; Acts 7:2, 26, 30, 13:31, 16:9; 1 Corinthians 15:5, 6,7, 8; 1 Timothy 3:16; and Revelation 11:19, 12:1, 3. In the New Testament, ὁράω and ὄφθη, are not used in connection with mere physical seeing as is generally the case with the verb βλέπω. Hence, ὄφθη conveys beyond the physical experience of the eyes but also, an encounter or appearance that leads to a tangible effect on its object, which re-informs the tangibility, reality and credibility of that appearance. In other words, ὄφθη affirms tangibility and consequently, a revelatory impact of a divine appearance’s impact on its object. This understanding of the use of ὄφθη then makes clearer meaning of the personal testimony Paul includes about himself from verse 9-11. Such a personal testimony re-affirms Paul’s own witness of the ὄφθη of the risen Jesus about whom he is testifying as having risen from the dead.

In summary, the necessity of Paul not just relying solely on the witness of the tradition belonging to the confession or creed, but also building up his case to include the witness of persons and groups is in itself an act in accordance with both the requirements of the Scriptures of Israel and ancient Israelite tradition (see Deuteronomy 19:15ff). And in verse 8, he firms up this eyewitness list, perhaps to strengthen his case and convince his skeptics beyond any doubt, by including himself as a witness (technically an eyewitness) to the resurrection. In all these, by using the verb ὄφθη, Paul is able to buttress the tangibility and

¹¹¹ See the list W. Michaelis has provided indicating how the Gospel writers and the author of Acts used ὁράω primarily in relation to the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus: “Mt. 28:9 f., 16 ff.; Lk. 24:13 ff., 36 ff., 50 ff.; Jn. 20:14 ff., 19 ff., 24 ff.; 21:1 ff.; Ac. 1:4 ff.” (1964: 355).

reality of the risen Lord actualizing it beyond a hallucination or an intangible experience. The impact this ὄφθη has had on his life (verse 9-11) is evidential to the reality of the message of the resurrection.

It could be beneficial to readers if most translations that render ὄφθη in this context simply as ‘he was seen’ or ‘he appeared’ would revise this rendering and treat the verb more as the technical term it represents in this discourse. I suggest “*he was made known*” as a more probable rendering that can include the epiphanous knowledge effect that comes with the context of ὄφθη. It can be confirmed that all the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus (known to us whether from the Gospels, Acts or Paul’s narrative) came with a teaching moment or interaction between him and the recipients.

As has already been mentioned above, the next verses 8-11 are a consequent testimony of Paul’s transformation after the risen Lord *was made known to him* (ὄφθη) by the God of Israel. There are words such as χάρις and κενὴ in this pericope, which can be discussed further in another context, that Paul uses to trigger this act of benefaction by the risen Lord and its impact on him as an ἀπόστολος.

5.3.3 Verses 12-19:

¹² Εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται, πῶς λέγουσιν ἐν ὑμῖν τινες ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν;

¹³ εἰ δὲ ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται·

¹⁴ εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται, κενὸν ἄρα [καὶ] τὸ κήρυγμα ἡμῶν, κενὴ καὶ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν·

¹⁵ εὐρισκόμεθα δὲ καὶ ψευδομάρτυρες τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι ἤγειρεν τὸν Χριστόν, ὃν οὐκ ἤγειρεν εἴπερ ἄρα νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται.

¹⁶ εἰ γὰρ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται·

¹⁷ εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται, ματαία ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν, ἔτι ἐστὲ ἐν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν,

¹⁸ ἄρα καὶ οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ ἀπόλωντο.

¹⁹ εἰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ ἐν Χριστῷ ἠλπικότες ἐσμὲν μόνον, ἐλεεινότεροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐσμέν.

5.3.3.1 Intertextual Analysis

Now, after his introductory statements and beginning here for the first time in the discourse, Paul addresses head-on the problem that has sparked the need to re-teach on this subject of the resurrection. Some members or groups from his Corinthian Jesus community were denying the resurrection of the dead (verse 12). A question which may not necessarily lie within the domain and objectives of this study is, who might these dissidents be? They could have been either *Ioudaios* or Hellenistic or Roman or from all three groups (see Gladd, 2009: 224). Paul's rhetoric in this chapter does not give away any names or guilty groups in particular. Perhaps, it is best to steer away from this speculation because all three these groups held varieties or streams of beliefs about the resurrection, and so, even though Paul's worldview is significantly *Ioudaios* by design, it has a reconfigured fulcrum, which is Christ the risen Lord whom he proclaims. In this pericope, for once, through his use of εἰ six times, Paul temporarily assumes the position of the skeptics and runs them through the theological (and even logical) implications of their stance on the subject.

Once again, to re-affirm some of the crucial points indicated above, Paul uses the verb forms of ἐγείρω nine times in this pericope, and seven of those are strictly assigned to Χριστός. In the early verses of 12-14, he uses the expression ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν for the other referencing and only in two instances in verse 15-16 does he use the expression νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται. The conscious choice of words is evident in this pericope. And this re-affirms the technical way in which Paul is using these terms undergirded by his *Ioudaios* background (see also the discussion on verse 1-5 above).

5.3.4 Verses 20-22:

²⁰ Νυνὶ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων.

²¹ ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι' ἀνθρώπου θάνατος, καὶ δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν.

²² ὡςπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται.

5.3.4.1 Intertextual Analysis

This pericope opens with an emphatic *Νυνὶ δὲ*, setting a sharp contrast between the previous section and the discourse about to proceed in this section. This section of three verses does not contain any direct citations. Nonetheless, there is an allusion, a metaphor and a typology that form the framework of *Ioudaios* concepts which point to Paul's interaction with the Scriptures of Israel.

The first in this section is a metaphor that Paul uses to point out the place of Christ as related to the resurrection - ἀπαρχή.¹¹² The term occurs outside the New Testament, in the Hellenistic world, as well as in the Old Testament vis-à-vis the Septuagint. Paul engages with it primarily as a *Ioudaios* concept. Hays provides further clarification: “here again we see that Paul interprets the death and resurrection of Jesus in Jewish apocalyptic categories. For one man alone to be raised is a great surprise in the Jewish apocalyptic framework” (Hays, 1997: 263). Even though Hays' statement about “Jewish apocalyptic categories” may sound sweeping, the statement, nonetheless represents a majority *Ioudaios* worldview concerning the resurrection (see Wright, 2008: 37).

According to G. Delling, “in the LXX ἀπαρχή is first used in the original sense...of the ‘first-fruits’ of the field or flocks... offered to God (Dt. 18:4; 26:2, 10; Nu. 18:8–12; Neh. 10:37 ff.; cf. Ez. 45:13–16) and thus separated to Him and sanctified (Nu. 5:9). The fiction is maintained that the ἀπαρχαί of men and cattle also belong to God (Nu. 18:15). The meaning of first-fruits can even be carried so far that τῶν πρωτογεννημάτων can be added to ἀπαρχή (Ex. 23:19; Sir. 45:20)” (1964a: 485). Therefore, the *Ioudaios* concept of ἀπαρχή, represented

¹¹² As will be discussed, subsequently, by this metaphor Paul also portrays an image of the position of his audience in the larger scheme of things with respect to Christ.

the offering of the first and best part, in thanksgiving, guarantee and assurance of the entire harvest. In the context of 1 Corinthians 15:20, by use of this metaphor and as *Ioudaios* concept, Paul is demonstrating firstly that, their denial of Christ's resurrection is definitely a denial of their own; Christ's resurrection as ἀπαρχή is a direct corollary of theirs. Secondly, and positively, their belief in and acceptance of Christ's resurrection is an affirmative guarantee of what they shall also experience (as part of the whole harvest).

Verses 21 and 22 mirror each other. By using typology, Paul draws parallels between Ἀδάμ and Χριστός. But what must be noted in these two verses is Paul's emphasis on δι' ἀνθρώπου and the implications of that for Χριστός. This point will be discussed further in verse 27 below. From an intertextual view, "this is the first reference to Adam in 1 Corinthians, and the manner of Paul's allusion shows that he expects his readers to know the story of Genesis 1-3 already" (Hays, 1997: 263). Therefore, in verse 21-22, Paul is once again relaying *Ioudaios* concepts concerning the origin of sin and death in the present world. Craig Keener affirms that "Jewish teachers often explained that Adam's sin brought sin and death into the world for everyone (4Ezra 4:30; 7:118; 2 Baruch 23:4; 48:42-43), and his descendants reenacted his sin in their own sins (4 Ezra 3:21, 26; 7:119; 2 Baruch 54:15, 19...)" (2014: 495).

The translation of ἀπαρχή as first-fruits in African mother tongue translations should be able to explore this technical term from an agrarian perspective rather than watering down the rich import of this technical term through a paraphrased approach.

5.3.5 Verses 23-24:

²³ Ἐκαστος δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι· ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός, ἔπειτα οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ,

²⁴ εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν.

5.3.5.1 Intertextual Analysis

Once again, there are no direct citations present in verse 23-24. However, some scholars seem to have missed the presence of an important allusion looming in the background of Paul's discourse (see for example Ciampa & Rosner, 2007). In verse 23, Paul once again introduces a metaphor - τάγματι from the root noun τάγμα. In the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, G. Delling indicates that "τάγμα usually means the result of τάσσειν, what is 'ordered,' 'fixed'" (1964b: 31). Perhaps, this popular meaning is what has led most English translations to translate the noun loosely as "order". However, Delling points out another meaning of the noun as "often a specific group, a military division or troop" (1964b: 31). The literary context of this pericope (verse 20-28) seems to provide more support for the latter understanding. Hays' observation on this is worth noting here: "Paul's use of the term *tagma* ('order, rank' – usually used of soldiers) in verse 23 signals the beginning of a military metaphor that dominates verses 23-28" (1997: 264). Hence, in the following verses, Paul will continue to use the verbal roots and forms of this metaphor to communicate how Christ's power will be displayed as a result of the resurrection.

Another important reason to explain this military understanding of the noun τάγμα during translation work may be the intertextual echo of Exodus 12 that seems to permeate Paul's discourse in verse 23-24. I make this unique observation,¹¹³ with specific reference to Exodus 12:51(BHS) –

וַיְהִי בַעֲצָם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הוֹצִיא יְהוָה אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם עַל־צְבָאוֹתָם: פ

The Hebrew noun clause על־צְבָאוֹתָם has been translated "by their regiments" (NET); "by their divisions" (NIV and TNIV); "in their armies" (NJB); and finally, "company by company"

¹¹³ In my readings on the subject, I am yet to come across any work or scholar who has proposed this intertextual connection of verse 23-24 to the Exodus 12 account.

(NRSV). It definitely describes an ordered marching out of the children of Israel from Egypt. Paul is familiar with the account of the Exodus and in the case of his audience in Corinth, certainly, 1 Corinthians 10 is a vivid example of a typology Paul recounted between them and the people of Israel, whom he called οἱ πατέρες (my translation: the ancestors). The LXX renders the Hebrew noun as σὺν δυνάμει αὐτῶν (*lit.* with/in their power or might) and it also conveys a military sense. One may presume that by positing an intertextual echo of Exodus 12:51 in 1 Corinthians 15:23-24, the LXX does not offer direct assistance; but to the contrary, a careful intertextual reading of the power display that is about to unfold in the subsequent verses 24-28, goes on to affirm the imagery in the backdrop of Paul's discourse, which his audience will be certain not to miss. Both the Hebrew text and the LXX rendering of Exodus 12:51 provide intertextuality for 1 Corinthians 15:23-24. In other words, and true to *Ioudaios* conceptualisation, just like the people of Israel, οἱ πατέρες, those who are of Christ (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) will also be raised with Christ in their regiments, with all might and power, prepared for the defeat of the final enemy.

5.3.6 Verses 25-26:

²⁵ δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρι οὗ θῆ ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.
²⁶ ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος·

5.3.6.1 Intertextual Analysis

Paul is still laying out the events that must (δεῖ) take place as far as the resurrection is concerned. The importance and necessity of these events are clearly emphasized by his use of δεῖ at the beginning of this verse.

However, the strength of his assertions is developed in the intertextual field that scholars such as Hays (1989, 1997) and Ciampa & Rosner (2007: 745) identify in Paul's statement from

verses 25-27 as an allusion to Psalms 110:1 (MT, 109:1 for LXX) and 8:7 (MT and LXX). However, in Chapter 4 of this research, I indicated that Silva (1993) for example, places verse 25 under a debated section in his categorisation. Elsewhere, J.P. Heil (2005) has discussed other scholars who claim this verse not to be from the Scriptures of Israel but from a Christological tradition (see Heil, 2005: 206 n.4). I discuss this text below as an allusion from the Scriptures of Israel:

Table 5.3.6.1 – Allusion 1 Corinthians 15:25

1 Corinthians 15	Allusion	
	MT	LXX
<p>Verse 25 δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρι οὗ θῆ ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.</p>	<p>Psalm 110:1 BHS לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר נְאֻם יְהוָה לְאֲדֹנָי יְשׁוּב לִימִינַי עַד-אֲשֶׁר יִתְּאֵי אֲיֹתָיִךְ הָהֵם לְרַגְלֶיךָ:</p>	<p>Psalm 109:1 LXT τῷ Δαυιδ ψαλμός εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου</p>

Verse 25 is acknowledged as an allusion because it lacks any of the popular introductory formulae. Yet, it stands as an important allusion providing support for the preceding narratives concerning how and why things will unfold during the resurrection.

On the surface, it seems the allusion is a mere reminder by Paul befitting his exact rhetorical purpose at this stage (consider the connection with verse 24). Nonetheless, it is a close allusion to both the Hebrew text and the LXX (also because the MT and LXX texts do not differ much from each other). Firstly, in the Psalm 110 (109 LXX) allusion Paul reproduces the text via indirect speech and hence, the sense of the first and/or second person in the Hebrew and LXX is replaced by the third person in 15v.25. Paul introduces *πάντας* which both the MT and LXX do not have. Also, he omits *ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν* (*lit.* footstool for the feet)/*לְרַגְלֶיךָ* (*lit.* stool for the foot) and opts for the expression *ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ*. Paul may have implied this noun phrase but avoids its explicit use in the statement. Another

more probable indication will be to look at the objects or elements (in verses 24-28) which Paul goes on to point out to occupy the place ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. As will be seen in verse 28, Paul seems to avoid the impression that the Son will also be a footstool (verse 28). One notes further that the 1 Corinthians 15:25 text follows the LXX more closely than the MT by staying with the plural rendering ‘feet’ even though Paul uses it as direct object (accusative) and the LXX goes with the indirect object of the noun. Finally, with the LXX, Paul’s text uses ἄχρι οὗ instead of ἕως ἄν. Yet again, it seems this was not just an accidental memory lapse from the LXX. This is because while ἕως ἄν from the LXX plays the role of a condition for the preceding phrase, Paul’s use of ἄχρι οὗ apparently stems from the semantics and use of the Hebrew כִּי and might imply purpose or end-goal rather than mere condition. And so even though English versions commonly translate the text as “until”, it might be more suitable to render it as “then”.

Following Paul’s use of pronouns in his allusion, in contrast to the MT and LXX, in 1 Corinthians 15:25, it seems Christ is the one who will be destroying every rule and every authority and power (v. 24) and will end up reigning purposefully to accomplish this end-goal of putting all his enemies under his feet. 1 Corinthians 15:25 does not seem to indicate that this is an action to be done by God the Father. There may not be any clear *Ioudaios* concepts in these two verses. Nonetheless, θάνατος represented here as ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς fits *Ioudaios* conceptualizations about death and its final defeat by God and his anointed one. The Psalms are vocal on this aspiration.

5.3.7 Verse 27:

²⁷ πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. ὅταν δὲ εἶπη ὅτι πάντα ὑποτέτακται, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα.

5.3.7.1 Intertextual Analysis

Unlike verse 25, this verse has received scholarly consensus as a citation from Psalm 8:7. Initially Paul does not introduce the citation, but later he refers to the Scriptures of Israel by using the expression ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ, and also introduces the popular ὅτι used mostly to introduce direct quotations. Psalm 8, in its initial context, praises how God has endowed humankind. Two designations the Psalmist uses in 8:5 which provide important intertextual discussion for Paul's literary context in 1 Corinthians 15 are – שׁוֹנֵי אָדָם and בְּרִי־אָדָם . Both terms suggest the mortality of humankind. So it seems that while the allusion in verse 25 draws out the divine nature of Christ, on the other hand, the citation in verse 27 of Psalm 8:7 highlights the human nature of the Christ. In both instances, as both God and man, Christ is set as the ultimate. This ontological set-up is important to acknowledge because already from verses 20-23, Paul has placed Christ and Adam within a certain literary context. Hence, an intertextual reading of Paul's engagement with the Scriptures of Israel demonstrates how he is still unearthing the realities of Christ's nature (verse 21) as the true heir to the resurrection.

And hence, the words in this citation are:

Psalm 8:7 BHS

מְשִׁילֶהוּ בְּמַעֲשֵׂי יְדָיָיו כֹּל שֵׁתָהּ תַּחַת רַגְלָיו׃

Psalm 8:7 LXT

καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ

Here, Paul's use of πάντα is in line with the MT and the LXX. Again, his choice of a specific word, in line with the LXX and distinct from the MT, contributes to the intertextuality of verses 20-28. Instead of שֵׁתָהּ “put” or “set” in the MT, Paul opts for ὑπέταξεν which many translations render as “to put under subjection.” However, following carefully the literary

context of Paul's intertextual engagement and consistent with this pericope (verses 20-28), I recommend that it might be insightful to consider "to place or arrange or assign". An in-depth reading of this pericope which the literary method of intertextuality provides, enables one to see that Paul is using this Greek word to unfold a *Ioudaios* concept of creation and God's plan for humanity.

The rhetorical and intertextual function of these two OT scriptural texts can be seen in the following verses (26-28) as Paul dwells on the varying nuances of the verbal forms - ὑποτάσσεται, ὑποτάξαντος. This discussion will be picked up in the concluding verse (v. 28) of this pericope, where Paul uses this verbal form more extensively.

5.3.8 Verse 28:

²⁸ ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε [καὶ] αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, ἵνα ἡ ὁ θεὸς [τὰ] πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν.

5.3.8.1 Intertextual Analysis

This verse does not have any allusions or citations, but serves to summarize the key issues Paul has been raising in this pericope. At the centre of this summary is Paul's use of the verb ὑποτάσσω. As indicated above, it is widely translated as "to put under subjection." However, from an intertextual reading, I recommend a re-translation of these verbal forms.

The current translation of the verse in many well-known English translations poses certain theological or doctrinal difficulties. Hays (1997) proposes a possible clarification, at the same time hinting at the theological difficulty at stake in the text, as follows: "It is impossible to avoid the impression that Paul is operating with what would later come to be called a subordinationist Christology. The doctrine of the Trinity was not yet formulated in Paul's

day, and his reasoning is based solely on the scriptural texts themselves, read in light of his Jewish monotheistic conviction and his simultaneous conviction that Jesus is proclaimed as ‘Lord’ by virtue of his resurrection” (1997: 266). Hence, for Hays, the problem simply lies with Paul’s theological understanding at the time or even perhaps, of his time. This view is untenable. Paul’s (primary) letters in general, show evidence contrary to this explanation (see for example Philippians 2:5-11).

Firstly, I recommend that careful attention should be given to the verbal forms of ὑποτάσσω which Paul started playing out for his rhetorical purpose from verse 23. For the objectives of this research, it is probable to deduce that the verb root is being used to construct a *Ioudaios* concept. Therefore, in this verse 28, it could be more probable to render ὑποταγήσεται as a passive with a middle voice as can be seen in texts such as Luke 2:51 and Ephesians 5:21. The importance of this approach is the intertextual context within which Paul is making this case about the Christ and God. From verse 23, Paul has indicated that πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν (v.24), πάντα τοὺς ἐχθροὺς (v.25) and τὰ πάντα (v.28) shall all be ὑποταγῆ αὐτῷ (v.28). And this will be inevitable, even an exercise of power by God and Christ (or through Christ). Now, the questions that arise are: does this display of power of compulsive subordination apply to Christ as well? Is that the imagery Paul seeks to present or is it a controversy of translation that has failed to acknowledge the intertextuality at work within the entire pericope (verse 21-28)? For the sake of sound biblical teaching, it is crucial to explicate the voluntary nature (the middle voice) of Christ’s subordination (ὑποταγήσεται), and this is possible through the middle voice rendering of the verb. This is the exact case I observe in the translation of the verse in the New Asante-Twi Bible of the Bible Society of Ghana. I refer to the rendering here: “Na se ɔnya de nnoɔma nyinaa gu ne nan ase a, ɛno ansa na ɔba no ara nso de ne ho behye deɛ ɔde nnoɔma nyinaa guu ne nan ase no aseɛ, na Onyankopɔn aye ade nyinaa mu ade nyinaa” (*lit.* And when he has completed placing all

things under his feet, then only, shall the Son, also, submit himself under the One who placed all things at his feet, so that God shall become all things in all things). It is relevant to mention that the Asante-Twi mother-tongue does not have the passive voice in its syntax.

5.3.9 Verses 29-34:

- ²⁹ Ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν;
- ³⁰ Τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν πᾶσαν ὥραν;
- ³¹ καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω, νῆ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν, [ἀδελφοί], ἣν ἔχω ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.
- ³² εἰ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ἐθριομάχησα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, τί μοι τὸ ὄφελος; εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν.
- ³³ μὴ πλανᾶσθε· φθείρουσιν ἡθὴ χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακαί.
- ³⁴ ἐκνήψατε δικαίως καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε, ἀγνωσίαν γὰρ θεοῦ τινες ἔχουσιν, πρὸς ἐντροπὴν ὑμῖν λαλῶ.

5.3.9.1 Intertextual Analysis

This pericope (29-34) shares similarities with the opening pericope verse 3-11. In both pericopes Paul observes and discusses a tradition: in verse 3-4, it is a tradition about which he is positive, but in verse 29, his disposition towards the tradition is uncertain, revealing only that he questions its necessity if its participants reject the resurrection. Also, in verse 8-11 and verse 30-32, he writes about his own ministry and its relation to the matter at hand.

The specific tradition invoked in verse 29 is still not clear to most scholars besides being general allusions to Hellenistic or *Ioudaios* ancient practices for the dead. From my perspective, the discussion is complicated by Paul's (typical) broad use of the terminology βαπτίζομαι both in this letter and within his earlier letters. Craig S. Keener suggests that "this expression may refer to washings of the dead before burial, a standard Jewish custom; religious groups in the ancient Mediterranean supervised the burials of their own members" (2014: 493). But, yet again, Paul is talking about οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν and not

merely, the dead being washed before burial as Keener seems to imply. For Hays, the text draws some analogies with a similar action by Judas Maccabeus from 2 Maccabees 12:43-45 (see Hays, 1997: 267). I refer to the text below: 2 Maccabees 12:43-45 LXT

⁴³ ποιησάμενός τε κατ' ἀνδρολογίαν εἰς ἀργυρίου δραχμᾶς δισχιλίας ἀπέστειλεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα προσαγαγεῖν περὶ ἁμαρτίας θυσίαν πάνυ καλῶς καὶ ἀστείως πράττων ὑπὲρ ἀναστάσεως διαλογιζόμενος

⁴⁴ εἰ μὴ γὰρ τοὺς προπεπτωκότας ἀναστήναι προσεδόκα περισσὸν καὶ ληρῶδες ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν εὐχεσθαι

⁴⁵ εἶτε' ἐμβλέπων τοῖς μετ' εὐσεβείας κοιμωμένοις κάλλιστον ἀποκείμενον χαριστήριον ὅσια καὶ εὐσεβῆς ἢ ἐπίνοια ὅθεν περὶ τῶν τεθνηκότων τὸν ἐξίλασμον ἐποιήσατο τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀπολυθῆναι

The similarities occur in verse 44 and 45, where Judas Maccabeus made atonement for the sins of the dead through a sin offering and the writer indicates that he did this on the basis of his belief in the resurrection. Is it possible to deduce that Paul condoned what the believers in Corinth were doing on behalf of the dead as reasonable as a whole, and that his only contention is that unlike Judas Maccabeus, they practise this tradition while denying belief in the resurrection? There is some credence to this view. And certainly, 2 Maccabees 12:43-45 provides a viable intertextual context to appreciate what is at stake in 1 Corinthians 15:29.

From an African context, there are different cultural references that point to rituals that are performed to the living on behalf of the dead – this is done especially to or by close kin, children and/or spouse(s). Generally, in the African context, there is strong belief in life after death as related to life in the world of the dead or the underworld. But there is no evidence for African belief systems supporting resurrection or a bodily coming back to life of a dead person from the underworld. Nonetheless, this has been claimed to be attempted by certain spiritual leaders, as in legends about one *Okomfo* Anokye of the Asante of the then Gold Coast (Ghana). These issues on life after death in the African context will be re-discussed further in Chapter 6.

Next in this pericope, Paul once again references his own ministry and its difficulties to provide example in support of his discourse. On verse 30 Ciampa and Rosner regard “Paul’s remark that the apostles are in constant danger from opponents of the gospel echoes the language of Ps. 44:22; 119:109” (2007: 746).

But in bringing this section to a close, Paul cautions forcefully with two references which scholars generally agree to be drawn from Isaiah 22:13 for 1 Corinthians 15:32c – φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὐριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν. and the other from Menander, 1 Corinthians 15:33 – μὴ πλανᾶσθε· φθείρουσιν ἥθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακαί. For the objectives of this research, I will focus on the former.

The text is regarded as a direct citation, and both Ellis (1957) and Silva (1993) (see Chapter 4 for discussion) differ on whether the LXX and the MT agree.

BHS – Isaiah 22:13

וְהָיָה וְשָׂוֹן וְשִׁמְמָה הָרְגָה בְּקֶרֶךְ וְשִׁתְּתָא זָאן כָּל בְּשָׂר וְנַפְשׁוֹת גַּיִן אֶכּוֹל וְנִשְׂתֵּי כִּי מִתָּר נִמּוֹת:

LXT – Isaiah 22:13

αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐποίησαντο εὐφροσύνην καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα σφάζοντες μόσχους καὶ θύοντες πρόβατα ὥστε φαγεῖν κρέα καὶ πιεῖν οἶνον λέγοντες φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν αὐριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν

1 Corinthians 15:32 does not cite the entire text of Isaiah 22:13 but rather the part which had also become popular especially by the New Testament era - λέγοντες φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν αὐριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν.¹¹⁴ The slight difference between the LXX, to which 1 Corinthians 15:32 corresponds more closely, and the MT, is the change from the qal imperfect of the verb

¹¹⁴ Craig Keener has elaborated on this citation as follows: “He quotes Isaiah 22:13 (with its context about judgment on the wicked); cf. Sirach 14:16; Luke 12:19. (The Old Testament often uses the language of eating and drinking in a neutral way—Eccles 2:24; 5:18-19; cf. 3:12— but without God it is never enough for life—Is 22:12-14; Eccles 11:7-12:14; cf. 7:2, 14.)” (2014: 494).

root :תרימך to the present active indicative form of ἀποθνήσκομεν. Hays describes the context of Isaiah 22:12-14's intertextuality with 1 Corinthians 15:32 as follows: "Paul suggests that their skepticism has led them to act like the frenzied inhabitants of Jerusalem who faced siege and annihilation at the hands of the Assyrians... instead of facing their fate with repentance and weeping, they decided to "party like there was no tomorrow," as the colloquial English expression has it" (1997: 268).

Notwithstanding the befitting intertext and analogy that Isaiah 22:12-14 provides for reading 1 Corinthians 15:32, the famous cliché saying of φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν, from the Scriptures of Israel (see footnote 10), commonly known or used in the Sadducean sect and further, its infamous attribution to Epicureanism all could not be far from contributing to Paul's memory in reproducing it for the rhetoric of this pericope. Whichever the case, there is evidence of profound intertextuality at play and it is worth considering the case, that Isaiah 22:12-14 sheds light considering the connecting contexts of looming danger and death in both texts.

5.3.10 Verses 35-41:

³⁵ Ἄλλ' ἐρεῖ τις· πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί; ποίῳ δὲ σώματι ἔρχονται;

³⁶ ἄφρων, σὺ δ' σπεῖρεις, οὐ ζῶοποιεῖται ἐὰν μὴ ἀποθάνῃ·

³⁷ καὶ ὁ σπεῖρεις, οὐ τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον σπεῖρεις ἀλλὰ γυμνὸν κόκκον εἰ τύχοι σίτου ἢ τίνος τῶν λοιπῶν·

³⁸ ὁ δὲ θεὸς δίδωσιν αὐτῷ σῶμα καθὼς ἠθέλησεν, καὶ ἐκάστῳ τῶν σπερμάτων ἴδιον σῶμα.

³⁹ Οὐ πᾶσα σὰρξ ἢ αὐτὴ σὰρξ ἀλλ' ἄλλη μὲν ἀνθρώπων, ἄλλη δὲ σὰρξ κτηνῶν, ἄλλη δὲ σὰρξ πτηνῶν, ἄλλη δὲ ἰχθύων.

⁴⁰ καὶ σώματα ἐπουράνια, καὶ σώματα ἐπίγεια· ἀλλ' ἑτέρα μὲν ἢ τῶν ἐπουρανίων δόξα, ἑτέρα δὲ ἢ τῶν ἐπιγείων.

⁴¹ ἄλλη δόξα ἡλίου, καὶ ἄλλη δόξα σελήνης, καὶ ἄλλη δόξα ἀστέρων· ἀστὴρ γὰρ ἀστέρος διαφέρει ἐν δόξῃ.

5.3.10.1 Intertextual Analysis

Like in verse 20-28, the discourse shifts once again to the verity of the resurrection. At this stage, by generating a dialogue setting with an interlocutor and bringing up some of their queries, it seems Paul seeks to disabuse the minds of his implied audience from their misconceptions about the resurrection. Using a diatribe rhetorical technique to engage his audience enables him to attack their misconceptions head-on. The apparent harshness of this address regarding their misconceptions can be observed in Paul's response ἄφρων, to the questions πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί; ποίῳ δὲ σώματι ἔρχονται; Hays refers to the response as "a scornful response" (Hays, 1997: 270). But more importantly, one cannot miss an intertextual echo which the rebuke is probably meant to evoke. Both Hays (1997) and Ciampa & Rosner (2007) agree on the intertextual echo of Psalm 14 in the tone of Paul's rebuke. There is a similar possible repetition of this Psalm 14 at Psalm 53. Both scholars point out that Paul is certainly familiar with the Psalm and the accompanying rebuke as seen in Romans 3:11-12 (Hays, 1997: 270; see Ciampa & Rosner, 2007: 746). Hays suggests a connection in the intertextual function of this rebuke as follows: "this word of stern rebuke introduces a section in which Paul turns the tables on the Corinthians, suggesting that they, not he, are guilty of crude literalism. Paul insists that the concept of "resurrection of the dead" should not be naively understood to refer to the resuscitation of corpses; rather, the concept of resurrection necessarily entails transformation into a new and glorious state. Any fool should realize that, Paul implies" (1997: 270).

I agree that this is one way to look at the function of that intertext in the pericope of 1 Corinthians 15:35-36. Another contribution this research seeks to make to the discussion is to look at the Hebrew rendering of the Greek noun ἄφρων of the Psalm 14:1 - נָבָל . The noun echoes the name of Nabal from the account of 1 Samuel 25, who was drinking and eating spontaneously, oblivious of impending danger and possible death at the hand of David whom

he had despised and toward whom he been ungrateful. Like the Corinthian(s) in Paul's rhetoric, Nabal was living only for the moment as if there were no tomorrow. And so this rebuke from Paul could carry a double-edged effect from the previous pericope (32-34) on the life of debauchery that, like Nabal, his Corinthian audience have plunged themselves into, oblivious of the associated dangers. Hence, an apparent narrative intertextuality could be looming over this text and Paul's use of ἄφρων can be regarded as a technical term with intertextual evocations in the rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15.

Consequently, based on the above, I also deduce that the problem at the centre of the Corinthian dilemma concerning the resurrection is not merely an intellectual matter or a case of ignorance as the noun ἄφρων could easily be made to portray. More crucially, there seems to be an exercise of unbelief that has triggered immoral or ungodly living, and this is a perspective an intertextual analysis enables readers to discover. The literary context of Psalm 14 or Psalm 53 demonstrates that the use of ἄφρων or its Hebrew לִנְיָ, signals a disposition of unbelief. Therefore, as a likely *Ioudaios* concept, I propose this noun could be rendered or translated to reflect the intertextual echo that Paul's audiences are most likely to hear. In other words, Paul was describing the Corinthian believers or more likely, his interlocutor(s), as "ignorant and unbelieving". This is the rendering I recommend will satisfy both sides of Paul's rebuke.

If Paul perceives his interlocutor(s) to be ignorant and unbelieving, he must proceed to provide analogies and necessary information on the nature and manner of the resurrection. This is similar to the previous pericope verse 20-28, but there, he provided instruction on the agency, purpose and timeline for the resurrection. Nonetheless, one thing common to the literary context and content of the entire discourse is the prevailing undercurrents of his *Ioudaios* background being portrayed throughout in the concepts and his both subtle and overt engagement with the Scriptures of Israel. The next verses continue to demonstrate this

point. Even though in verse 36-41, Paul draws on analogies from nature, these analogies still are driven by *Ioudaios* perspectives. Craig Keener highlights some of these key points of connection in his commentary on the text (see Keener, 2014: 494). He refers to texts from the Scriptures of Israel that seem to share correlations with Paul's analogies and line of discourse.¹¹⁵ Nonetheless, I can indicate that the creation account, especially Genesis 1:9-26, which emphasises each creation in its own kind or likeness is also in a subtle intertextual play in this pericope. The LXX text of Genesis 1:9-26 reflects this intertextual echo. In the next verses, this intertextual echo emerges gradually and boldly into a citation.

5.3.11 Verses 42-44:

- ⁴² Οὕτως καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐγείρεται ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ·
⁴³ σπείρεται ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δόξῃ· σπείρεται ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δυνάμει·
⁴⁴ σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν. Εἰ ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν.

5.3.11.1 Intertextual Analysis

Moving on from the analogies and building on the rationale behind them, Paul proceeds to apply this to the resurrection body. Although, verse 42-50 could be discussed as one whole pericope, I have separated them in order to be able to deal with the discussions emerging from the texts.

A translation problem emerges from verse 44 - σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν. Εἰ ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν. And this is related specifically to the two expressions σῶμα ψυχικόν and σῶμα πνευματικόν. In the Greek, this is one of the

¹¹⁵ Hays has also made such correlations, citing for example that “particularly pertinent in relation to 1 Corinthians 15 is Daniel 12:2-3, one of the very few passages in the Old Testament that prefigure belief in the resurrection of the dead” (1997: 271). Both Hays and Keener have acknowledged that there might be apparent similarities in thought-patterns between Paul and his Hellenistic context in this line of analogies. But they are also quick to draw a sharp contrast and lines of departure indicating that Paul is not in any manner entirely toeing the thought-patterns of Hellenistic beliefs and philosophies. There is solid indication that Paul's perspective concerning the resurrection is *Ioudaios* in general with some specific adaptations of his own due to his understanding and revelation of Jesus as the Messiah (see Hays, 1997: 271; Keener, 2014: 494-495).

defining moments in the discourse where Paul sets a sharp contrast between his *Ioudaios*-Christ perspective of the resurrection and that of the multifaceted Hellenistic context of his Corinthian audience.¹¹⁶ N.T. Wright's discussion on this verse is worth-noting:

The key adjectives, which are quoted endlessly in discussions of this topic, do not refer to a physical body and a nonphysical one, which is how people in our culture are bound to hear the words *physical* and *spiritual*. The first word, *psychikos*, does not in any case mean anything like "physical" in our sense. For Greek speakers of Paul's day, the *psychē*, from which the word derives, means the soul, not the body. But the deeper, underlying point is that adjectives of this type, Greek adjectives ending in *-ikos*, describe *not the material out of which things are made* but *the power or energy that animates them* (2008: 155, italics in original).

Unfortunately, this pivotal moment is lost on most Bible translations who simply render the expressions *σῶμα ψυχικόν* and *σῶμα πνευματικόν* as: "physical body... spiritual body" (NRSV); "natural body... spiritual body" (HCSB; NIV; LEB; ESV; NET); "physical bodies... spiritual bodies" (CEV); "natural bodies... spiritual bodies" (NLT); "ordinary human body... a body controlled by the Spirit" (CJB). The danger underlying these renderings is that they end up perpetuating the exact contradiction or misconception Paul's Hellenistic audience was entertaining. Paul's discourse in verse 35-41 brings to the fore that it is likely that Paul's audience, more likely the Hellenistic upper social class or elitists in the group, despised the idea or belief in a bodily resurrection. Further to this, in certain Hellenistic philosophical and/or religious sects such as the Gnostics (see Yamauchi, 2000: 416) the body as physical matter was not held in a positive light and was regarded as evil. Matter was generally regarded as evil in certain Hellenistic philosophical views like the Platonic ones. Hence, even those Hellenists who entertained some form of belief or perspective of a resurrection could never accept the concept of a bodily resurrection. Therefore, a spiritual resurrection could have been considered a more probable event for

¹¹⁶ Nonetheless, one can refer to Jeffery Asher's article discussing Paul's use of the metaphor in the verb *σπείρεται* as an anthropogenic metaphor sharing greater correlation with Hellenistic philosophy and etiological myths but adopted by "Jewish intellectuals to describe the creation of humankind in Gen 1-2" (2001: 122, see discussion Asher, 2001).

some. If Bible translations fail to render Paul’s *Ioudaios* concepts with their intertextual *Ioudaios* undercurrents in mind, they inadvertently end up (directly or indirectly) lending support for these same Hellenistic and philosophical beliefs which Paul sought to refute (see Hays, 1997: 271–272). For Hays, “by far the most graceful translation of verse 44, and the one that most conveys the meaning of Paul’s sentence, is found in the *Jerusalem Bible*: ‘When it is sown it embodies the soul, when it is raised it embodies the spirit. If the soul has its own embodiment, so does the spirit have its own embodiment’” (1997: 272). The importance of rendering this verse from an intertextual perspective with Paul’s *Ioudaios* background is buttressed by what Paul proceeds to do next. He cites from Genesis 2:7 in the next verse 45.

5.3.12 Verses 45-50:

⁴⁵ οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται· ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζῶσαν.

⁴⁶ ἀλλ’ οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικόν ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικόν, ἔπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν.

⁴⁷ ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.

⁴⁸ οἶος ὁ χοϊκός, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ χοϊκοί, καὶ οἶος ὁ ἐπουράνιος, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ ἐπουράνιοι·

⁴⁹ καὶ καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ, φορέσομεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανοῦ.

⁵⁰ Τοῦτο δέ φημι, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομησαὶ οὐ δύναται οὐδὲ ἡ φθορὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ.

5.3.12.1 Intertextual Analysis

This section opens with the direct citation captured in the table below:

Table 5.3.12.1 – Citation 1 Corinthians 15:45

1 Corinthians 15	Citation	
	MT	LXX
Verse 45 ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν	Genesis 2:7 BHS :הַיָּמִים שֶׁבָּרַךְ אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה	Genesis 2:7 LXT καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν

The citation is only a part and not the entirety of Genesis 2:7. Two important points to note are: the fact that Paul introduces ὁ πρῶτος into the citation and also, the apparent double emphasis he makes with the apposition, ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ.

As the discussion has proceeded from verse 44 in Paul's mind, it becomes clear that he sought to avoid blurring the lines (and although this is somewhat speculative, perhaps it was an aspect he had overlooked when he first taught the Corinthians on the resurrection). He is strenuously setting himself apart from the pervasive Hellenistic misconceptions in order to communicate effectively to his audience the clarity of his Gospel message.¹¹⁷ For example, concerning the exegesis that follows (verse 46-48), Ciampa & Rosner (2007) emphasize that "Philo's exegesis of Gen. 2:7 (*Alleg. Interp.* 1.31) is sometimes proposed as relevant to Paul's interpretation. However, the differences outweigh the similarities. Philo takes Adam's becoming a living soul to mean that God breathed into his corruptible, earthlike mind the power of real life. Whereas for Paul the earthly man is Adam and the heavenly man is Christ, for Philo both of these can be found in Genesis (albeit allegorically)" (2007: 746).¹¹⁸ However, concerning textual matters, as far as the available LXX manuscripts are concerned, Ciampa & Rosner (2007) discover some similarity (but not exact rendering) between Paul's ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ and what occurs in the Theodotion and the Symmachus versions of the LXX (see Ciampa & Rosner, 2007: 747). Their verdict is that "Paul's wording either reflects a common exegetical tradition or testifies to an earlier written text that he was using" (Ciampa & Rosner, 2007: 747).

¹¹⁷ Hays has expressed a similar observation as follows: "it is possible that all of this is a subtle rebuttal to an interpretation of Genesis that was influencing those Corinthians who thought of themselves as *pneumatikoi*. Perhaps their reading was more like Philo's, connecting "the heavenly man" with their own exalted knowledge and wisdom; if so, Paul's opposition between Adam and Christ seeks to reshape their understanding and to beckon them to look to the future transformation of their bodies" (1997: 273).

¹¹⁸ Hays (1997) shares similar remarks concerning this text with Ciampa & Rosner (2007). For him as well "this future eschatological orientation sharply distinguishes Paul's use of Genesis 2:7 from the reading of the creation story given by Philo" (Hays, 1997: 273).

This brings the discussion to another difficult textual matter which arises from Paul's discourse. In verse 49, Paul indicates that καὶ καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ, φορέσομεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου. In the Greek text, the textual problem arises with the verb future indicative active φορέσομεν, while other ancient manuscripts (see below) have the present subjunctive passive φορέσωμεν. Therefore, translators face a dilemma. For example, Bruce M. Metzger suggests that “exegetical considerations (i.e., the context is didactic, not hortatory) led the Committee to prefer the future indicative, despite its rather slender external support (B I 38 88 206 218 242 630 915 919 999 1149 1518 1872 1881 syr^P cop^{sa} eth *al*)” (Metzger, 1994: 502). I observe that this is an interesting decision since there is greater or stronger external evidence (Ⲕ46 Ⲭ A C D F G Ψ 075 0243 33 81 104 256 263 365 424 436 459 1175 1241 1319 1573 1739 1912 1962 2127 2200 2464 Byz [K L P] Lect it^{ar, b, d, f, g, o} vg cop^{bo} Marcion^{acc.} to Tertullian Irenaeus^{lat} Clement Origen^{gr}, ^{lat} Methodius Ps-Athanasius Gregory-Nyssa Didymus^{dub1/2} Macarius/Symeon Epiphanius Chrysostom Cyril^{5/11} Hesychius; Tertullian Cyprian Ambrosiaster Hilary Zeno Pacian Priscillian Gregory-Elvira Ambrose Jerome Pelagius Augustine Quodvultdeus) for φορέσωμεν. Hays also suggests support for φορέσωμεν, that Paul determined it “as an exhortation to his readers to look to the coming one Jesus Christ... rather than looking to their own wisdom or to some alleged primal divine image within” (1997: 274). Besides the NET Translation, the majority of English translations opt for the future active φορέσομεν. Indeed, based on the greater external evidence and coherence with internal evidence, I recommend support for the present hortatory subjunctive passive φορέσωμεν as the more sustainable reading.

Concluding on the intertextual matters, but still on verse 49, there is a subtle intertextual echo in the statement καὶ καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ with the text in Genesis 5:3 –

BHS

Daniel, the Greek word occurs mainly in Chapter 2 where Nebuchadnezzar's eschatological dream could not be revealed to any of τὸς ἐπαιδοὺς καὶ τὸς μάγους καὶ τὸς φαρμακοὺς τῶν Χαλδαίων (Dan. 2:2 LXX) but only to Daniel. From the literary development of the concept, G. Bornkamm has indicated that in Daniel “μυστήριον takes on for the first time a sense which is important for the further development of the word, namely, that of an eschatological mystery, a concealed intimation of divinely ordained future events whose disclosure and interpretation is reserved for God alone (ὁ ἀνακαλύπτων μυστήρια, 2:28, 29, cf. 2:47) and for those inspired by His Spirit (4:9 Θ). God's power to reveal mysteries raises him above heathen gods” (1964: 814–815). Benjamin L. Gladd has further affirmed the above assertions in his thorough study on μυστήριον as a technical concept (see Gladd, 2009). He has explored Paul's use of the term in his letter to the Corinthians and has deduced the embedded apocalyptic and eschatological elements of the term and how Paul engages with this *Ioudaios* concept in 1 Corinthians (see Gladd, 2009). Therefore, an intertextual echo might be intended in this statement (verse 51) by Paul, whereby, like Daniel who was inspired by the Spirit, Paul also juxtaposes himself (his discourse) against his Corinthian audience (especially those among them who denounce the resurrection), who like Nebuchadnezzar's attendants, through their mere intellectual, philosophical and perhaps, empty religious perspectives, are failing to receive and comprehend the mystery of the resurrection which is an eschatological event only the Spirit of God can reveal. Therefore, μυστήριον can be regarded as a technical *Ioudaios* conceptualisation in this discourse.

In verse 52, Paul, has already begun unravelling the contents of this μυστήριον. And here as well, it is possible to observe Paul's *Ioudaios* background as he mentions the raising of the dead ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι. Since both the adjective and the definite article are used with the noun, one come to realize that Paul is not referring to any ordinary trumpet. Hays has expressed that “the trumpet as a sign of ‘the day of the Lord’ is a standard symbol of Jewish

prophetic-apocalyptic literature (see e.g., Isa. 27:13; Joel 2:1; Zeph. 1:14-16; 2 Esdras 6:23; Matt. 24:31; Rev. 9:14)” (Hays, 1997: 274).¹¹⁹ However, the verse does not indicate who will be sounding this last trumpet.

The effect of the sounding of the trumpet brings the discourse to verses 54-55 where there seem to be two direct citations important for intertextual discussion. Paul introduces the quotations (without necessarily separating them) with the following words - τότε γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος. At this stage it is uncertain whether he expected his implied audience to identify these citations as coming from two different texts or whether he intended to make a seamless connection to achieve his rhetorical purposes. The table below presents the citations with their related MT and LXX references:

Table 5.3.13.1 – Citation 1 Corinthians 15:54b-55

1 Corinthians 15	Citation	
	MT	LXX
Verse 54b κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νῖκος.	Isaiah 25:8 BHS בְּלַע הַמָּוֶת לְצַחַח	Isaiah 25:8 LXT κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ισχύσας
Verse 55 ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νῖκος; ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον;	Hosea 13:14 BHS אֱהִי דַבְרִיךָ מִנֹּת אֱהִי קַטְבְּךָ שְׂאוֹל	Hosea 13:14 LXT ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου θάνατε ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου ἄδη

There have been long textual issues and discussions over what to do with how Paul is handling these texts from the Scriptures of Israel (which are not necessarily texts available to us today). Firstly, in 1 Corinthians 15:54b-55, these two verses are connected by the noun νῖκος. And yet, this noun does not recur in any of the reference texts (MT and LXX) in the table above. Scholars have made various attempts to unravel the accompanying textual, interpretive and citation controversies.

¹¹⁹ Craig Keener has similarly observed that “Old Testament prophets often employed the image of the trumpet, which was used to assemble people for convocation or war; here, as in a daily Jewish prayer of the period, it refers to the final gathering of God’s people at the end (cf. similarly Is 27:13)” (2014: 495).

When the citation in verse 54 is considered, neither the MT nor the LXX has a rendering related to the noun *vī*κος. There is consensus that the verse 54 citation is closer to the MT rendering than to the LXX. The LXX makes *ὁ θάνατος* the active subject whilst in verse 54, the verb is in a passive voice. However, on the issue of proposing a possible *Vorlage* for explaining these differences, J.P. Heil has remarked that

although the Theodotion version in uncial Q is identical to the Pauline version, it may be a later assimilation to 1 Cor 15:54b, especially since it occurs as a marginal gloss, and the Syrohexapla reading of Theodotion has the active rather than passive form of the verb. But the fact that Aquila and both Theodotion readings have “in victory” for the Hebrew “forever,” and Symmachus as well as the Theodotion uncial Q reading have the passive form of the verb, indicates a common tradition behind these translations. The agreements between them and Paul point to Paul’s dependence upon a preexisting, non-LXX Greek text of Isa 25:8a (2005: 249).¹²⁰

Nonetheless, it should not be neglected that Paul could be exercising his own literary insight and prowess in repackaging these texts for his rhetoric without necessarily going against the word of Scripture. This is a common feature and practice of ancient Judean textual exegesis and commentary (see Stanley, 1992). Hence, ancient first century CE authors like Paul should not be held to modern concerns informed by notions such as the inviolability of texts. This verse will be discussed further after looking at the textual matters in verse 55.

For verse 55, the citation shows similarities with the LXX text. Nonetheless, Paul’s citation has *vī*κος instead of *δική*. And also, the LXX has *ἔδη* and not *θάνατε* as in the case of verse 55. The MT differs from what we see in verse 55, where Paul has *vī*κος and *κέντρον*, the MT has *דְּבַרְיָי* and *קְטָרְיָי* respectively.

Now, even though there is some consensus on the context of Isaiah 25:8 and how Paul engages with it (Hays, 1997: 275–276; Heil, 2005: 251–252; see also Ciampa & Rosner, 2007: 747–748), this is not the same with the textual context of Hosea 13:14. In verse 55, which builds on directly from verse 54, Paul’s citation indicates the defeat of death, the last

¹²⁰ See J.P. Heil (2005: 248–249) for the texts to which he refers.

enemy, and so this citation functions to taunt this defeated foe. Contrary to this application, the related text from Hosea 13:14 signals God's displeasure with Israel and the consequent call of death as punishment for their sins. Paul has managed to achieve a unique rendering and reading of these two texts which still falls within the literary intertextual context of the eschatological and apocalyptic message of his own nested identities. And so, whether one seeks to link his technique to an ancient methodology or even attempts to discern a possible *Vorlage* for the rendering of these texts, it also cannot be disputed that Paul has repackaged these texts uniquely to achieve a rhetorical purpose. This confirms the working hypothesis of this research. The intertextual approach has been proven relevant to identify such unique literary trademarks.

Therefore, in this pericope, Paul's use of *μυστήριον* and *ἐσχάτη σάλπιγγι* have been identified as *Ioudaios* conceptualisations.

5.4 Conclusion

Referring to 1 Corinthians 15, N.T. Wright has observed that "the whole chapter echoes and alludes to Genesis 1-3" (2008: 155). This observation confirms an intertextual approach to the rhetoric of 1 Corinthians as a viable methodology. This intertextual approach to discussing the rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15 is evidence that Paul is well-versed in the traditions and Scriptures of Israel. Moreover, interpreters do away with the depth of his discourses when they ignore these *Ioudaios* undercurrents that still prevail in his writings and proclamation of the Gospel and consciously supplant them with anachronistic Christian motifs or even numb their effect through methodologies such as the historical-critical approaches. As Hays (1999) and Moyise (2002) have indicated elsewhere, intertextuality should not be regarded as an exercise of typology nor a midrash. This study does not seek to

make a case that Paul is supplanting the multifaceted nested identities of his audiences with a *Ioudaios* one. This is far from that approach. The study done in Chapters 2 and 3 have made that emphasis clear. For Paul, the Scriptures of Israel and the traditions of his ancestors have undergone a repositioning under a new fulcrum which is Christ (his cross and resurrection) and yet they still remain identifiably *Ioudaios* through and through. And for Paul, this repositioning is crucial to the Gospel narrative which he proclaims to his gentiles-in-Christ. The intertextual approach in this chapter has enabled the researcher to trace and map out this trail that Paul travels without imposing any notions of supersessionism or fulfillment themes.

In the next and final chapter, I will glean what has been discussed so far, highlighting the crucial points and perhaps, pointing out the possible weaknesses observed in the use of an intertextual methodology. This final chapter will also explore the impact of these outcomes for the multifaceted contexts of contemporary African audiences, especially with respect to the field of translation studies.

CHAPTER 6

6.0 1 Corinthians 15 – Translation, Postcolonial Issues and *Ioudaios* Concepts

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapter undertook an intertextual approach to discussing the rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15. This approach has re-affirmed discoveries which scholars have made, who have used the method of intertextuality in their own analysis and reading of 1 Corinthians 15. Further to this, the intertextual approach has been able to identify fresh evidence of new discoveries which can further enrich the reading and analysis of 1 Corinthians 15. In this final chapter the research seeks to bring together the various important elements addressed in the preceding chapters, accounting for this work against the backdrop of an overview of what has already been argued, while paying attention to the unique contributions the analysis has made to the field of study. The final questions that remain are: in what way(s) can translators explore the effective projection of these intertextual elements which, inadvertently, go a long way toward influencing and “illuminating”¹²¹ interpretation? What is the way forward for the specific multifaceted contexts of Africa and these *Ioudaios* conceptualisations, in reading Paul and the Scriptures?

6.2 Chapter 5 in Review: Gleanings and Contribution to Academic Knowledge

This section would seek to revisit the objectives and discussions from Chapters 2, 3 and 4, exploring their culmination in Chapter 5.

In Chapter 2, the research explored Paul’s *Ioudaios* ethnocultural identity and affirmed that his identity is crucial to a reading of his letters, even though he wrote to primarily gentile

¹²¹ A word I borrow from Dale R. Hoskins (2017).

Christ-believing communities. This is because, contrary to the anachronistic assertion that Paul had converted to become a “Christian” and so had abandoned any form of *Ioudaios* expressions or associations (see Chapter 2), Paul engaged with the Scriptures of Israel as well as *Ioudaios* concepts thoroughly in his rhetoric. In Chapter 5, these matters were illustrated by showing that Paul engaged, directly and indirectly, with Scriptures from primarily, Genesis, and also, Exodus, Psalms, Isaiah, Hosea, Daniel and the Apocalyptic literature of Israel. The entire rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 15 bears the principle of the creation narrative, and Paul’s thoughts and Scripture memory were modelled around Genesis 1-3. However, beyond this and also in order to emphasize Paul’s unique and active engagement with these Scriptures, the research further proposed that Paul manifested the role as a translator-interpreter who actively re-interpreted texts and concepts in order to communicate with his implied audiences. The intertextual analysis of 1 Corinthians 15 has shown us that, for the sake of his implied audiences, Paul was conscious and selective in his Scripture activity as a translator-interpreter. For example, his allusion to Psalm 110/109 in verse 25 demonstrates how he makes omissions and additions to the Scriptures which should be regarded neither as arbitrary nor as memory lapses but rather as a conscious act of “translation” and reinterpretation. This conscious rendering of the allusion sets the stage for the citation of Psalm 8 in verse 27. The intertextual analysis made in that pericope (verses 20-28) demonstrates this fact (see Chapter 5). In verse 29, the strange ritualistic practice administered on behalf of the dead and Paul’s apparent silence or non-condemnatory remarks, in the form of a mere reference to it, has been a difficult practice to discuss even for those who employ the historical-critical methods. But once again, the possibility of understanding Paul’s apparent unperturbed reference to the ritual was demonstrated through an intertextual analogy with a similar act by Judas Maccabeus in 2 Maccabees 12:43-45.

Furthermore, beyond allusions and direct or indirect citation of the Scriptures of Israel, the analysis in Chapter 5 also demonstrated Paul's use of *Ioudaios* concepts, metaphors and types. This was a unique feature of this research as most intertextual studies of Paul's use of Scriptures focus primarily on his citations, allusions and fewer others in more recent times, on intertextual echoes. Throughout 1 Corinthians 15, Paul's rhetoric of the Adam-Christ typology which featured dominantly in verses 20-28 and verses 45-50 was one example of Paul's ethnocultural background playing a crucial role in his perspective on the subject of the resurrection. And again, even in this shared *Ioudaios* Scripture context and experience, his citation and re-interpretation proved the point that Paul stood out uniquely in many crucial ways regarding the repositioning of the oral and written traditions of his ancestors (see Chapter 5 discussions verses 45-50). Another word that drew attention for an intertextual analysis was the noun *τάγμα*, which Paul used in verse 23. Once again, scholars such as Ciampa & Rosner (2007) who have focused on citations and allusions and do not go into the minute detail of unravelling the network of words Paul uses to generate an intertextual echo, tend to miss these important concepts. The effort in this approach lies in identifying words or concepts around which Paul weaves his rhetoric even with literary threads that hold his imagery and message together. And so, as was discussed in Chapter 5, a careful intertextual analysis of Paul's use of the noun *τάγμα* demonstrated how a military or conquest imagery borrowed from the Exodus account evolves with death as the final enemy to be defeated. Therefore, the study posited that the imagery of Exodus 12 and specifically Exodus 12:51 could be an intertextual echo providing an imaginative reading for 1 Corinthians 15:23-24. The analysis also raised concerns about the translation of noun *τάγμα*, which will be discussed further in the section below. Finally, in the opening of verse 51, Paul's use of *μυστήριον* was identified and discussed as a *Ioudaios* concept that should play a significant role in the interpretation of that pericope. Paul's use of this *Ioudaios* apocalyptic and

eschatological concept was also meant to function as an identity marker for implied audiences to identify Paul within the framework of his role as an apostle, as one who has received divine inspiration just like his predecessors such as Daniel in the Scriptures of Israel. In Chapter 3 Paul's Roman-Corinth audience was in focus. The chapter discussed the dynamics of these ancient audiences from the perspectives of historical-critical methods and importantly, also from a literary-critical approach. In discussing Paul's implied audience and his activity toward their identity formation as Gentiles-in-Christ, Paul's own identity necessarily also came into focus. It became evident in the analysis that for Paul, mission was not just about rhetorical adaptability but also, lifestyle adaptability (see Chapter 3). Hence, alongside scholars such as Caroline Johnson Hodge (2005, 2015), we could then make the assertion that Paul sustained the nested identities of his own *Ioudaios* ethnocultural identity whilst negotiating the identity formation of his implied audience through a repositioned reading of the Scriptures of Israel and *Ioudaios* concepts. In 1 Corinthians 15, the intertextual analysis in Chapter 5 demonstrated Paul's rhetorical adaptability, his being conscious of the literary and oral context of his rhetoric, as he negotiated the identity formation of his audience within that liminal space. A case in point is the discussion in verses 1-5 concerning Paul's preferred use of the verb ἐγήγερται instead of the more common Hellenistic term ἀνάστασις. The discussions showed that Paul's preference is probably connected to the verb ἐγείρω as a *Ioudaios* metaphor used primarily (from the intertestamental era and in the LXX) to describe the divine activity of God in bringing people back to life. But equally significant, in connection with the issues in Chapter 3 about Paul's implied audience, it was shown that the verb ἐγείρω enabled Paul to avoid the communication problems that his use of ἀνάστασις might have generated, especially among his Hellenistic audiences (see Chapter 5). Hence, as indicated, Paul uses the verb ἐγείρω and its verbal forms about nineteen times in 1 Corinthians 15 alone, most of which are connected to God's divine act of raising Christ from

the dead (see the discussion under verses 12-19). Another *Ioudaios* concept or word that speaks to the rhetorical situation of Paul's audience is the noun ἄφρων. Within the pericope consisting of verses 35-41, I discussed this noun as being used as a technical term. I also discussed that both Hays (1997) and Ciampa & Rosner (2007) agree on the intertextual echo which the noun makes to Psalm 14. However, as a unique contribution of this research, I further related the intertextual connection that Paul's use of this noun could have with the narrative account of Nabal from 1 Samuel 25. Even though some may argue that the echo is faint, I argued that if Paul's implied audiences were in any way familiar with the narrative, then both Nabal's name (1 Samuel 25:25) and his predisposition toward his impending danger at the hands of David and his men could mirror their own predisposition in ignoring the danger of their disbelief in and rejection of the resurrection, and their preferring to eat and drink. In fact, the popular cliché of "eating and drinking for there is no tomorrow" (addressed by Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:29-34) casts a perfect shadow over this pericope and gives more impetus to Paul's use of the rebuke as not a mere insult or rebuke. It was intended to evoke a keen realization or awakening of their rhetorical situation. Hence, I proceeded to infer that the common rendering of the rebuke ἄφρων as "fool" should be revisited in the light of these intertextual insights. Speaking to the rhetorical situation of Paul's implied audience, my inference was that Paul was addressing not merely their ignorance on the subject at hand, but also, their failure in terms of unbelief (see Chapter 5). This is a signal of how much awareness Paul has about the context of his implied audience.

Finally, in Chapter 4, I introduced intertextuality more comprehensively, as the literary-rhetorical method I would use in Chapter 5 to analyze 1 Corinthians 15. The objectives of using this literary methodology were to give unique attention to Paul's text and to pay closer attention to his Scripture interests and also, to emphasize the pervading presence of his *Ioudaios* ethnocultural background in his letters. Certainly, it goes without saying that, as

much as historical-critical methodologies that emphasize source text, textual matters and ancient methodologies have made striding contributions to these discussions over the past decades, they have not been successful in identifying Paul's unique contributions as distinct from those of his contemporaries. In Chapter 5 the intertextual analysis of certain pericopes, such as verses 45-50 demonstrate how Paul's exegesis and use of the citation from Genesis 2:7 differs from contemporaries such as Philo. Again, it was only by using a literary methodology, that concepts and ideas which Paul weaves with intertextual echoes begin to make beautiful notes in the ears of the audience. Such concepts and ideas are largely ignored when historical-critical methodologies are used to study Paul's use of Scripture. Further in the discussion, from Chapter 4 (but also emphasized in Chapter 1), another crucial reason for employing intertextuality, was to address and demonstrate the inaccuracy of the general concern and suspicion towards Paul's (for that matter the New Testament writers') use of Scripture and exegesis. Most historical-critical methods resign Paul's use of Scripture to ancient methods that are no longer applicable or legitimate as methods for reading Scripture in 21st century contemporary settings. The second part of this misplaced suspicion has to do with applications within the field of Bible translation. I will attempt to address these themes in the next section as I draw out the results and recommendations of this study towards a conclusion.

In summary, the intertextual analysis from Chapter 5 identified the following in 1 Corinthians 15:¹²²

- a. direct citations – v.27, v.32c, v.45, and vv.54b-55
- b. allusions (intertextual echoes) – v. 3-5; v. 25, vv.37-41, v.49, and vv.51-52

¹²² See Chapter 5 for the discussions and analysis on these findings and proposed recommendations.

- c. *Ioudaios* concepts and expressions - παρέδωκα (v.3), verbal forms of ἐγείρω, ὄφθη (vv.6-11); ἀπαρχή (v.20-24), the noun τάγματι (v.23-24), verbal forms of ὑποτάσσω, the noun ἄφρων (v.36), and μυστήριον (v.51)
- d. The following have been proposed for re-translation in Bible translation projects - καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς (v.4); ὄφθη, ἀπαρχή, ἄχρι οὔ, verbal forms of ὑποτάσσω, the noun ἄφρων, σῶμα ψυχικόν and σῶμα πνευματικόν (v. 44), and φορέσωμεν (v.49).
- e. Paul's unique "adjustments" of texts such as the citations and/or allusions in vv. 25-27 and 54-55.

6.3 1 Corinthians 15: An Intertextual Reading of the Bible and its Translation Intertextually for Africa¹²³

The subject of death and life beyond this earthly physical realm is a crucial one in the African context. From the proliferation of extravagant funeral rites to the detailed rituals performed for all kinds of death occurrences and for the kinds of persons to whom these are done, one can read powerful indicators of the worldviews Africans hold about this subject. And if the Corinthians are baptizing on behalf of the dead, then, in Africa, the living undertake several other "stranger" rituals all on behalf of the life that has passed on into the next. Death, from the African context, is not the end of the journey but a transition into a next life, also known as the spirit world or the world of the dead or the underworld. In the African worldview, this is a world which has definite contact with this physical one. Hence, Africans are conscious of

¹²³ This focus of the discussion on the African context follows in the steps of works such as Segovia & Tolbert (1995a,b) and Smith-Christopher (1995) which highlight the cultural-critical importance for scholars especially from non-European cultural contexts to acknowledge and bring into play their own contexts as they engage with the texts of Scripture.

the presence and reality of the world of the departed which interacts with the world of the living. The ancestors who have gone ahead are still venerated in many African homes, and so during community festivals and traditional occasions, they are invited through libations and prayers to partake and be present. Hence, life after death is a reality in most, if not all, African contexts. But on the other hand, the concept of a resurrection of the dead, whether of an individual or as an anticipation of a future experience by a group, is an inconceivable expectation within the African context. Perhaps, we can identify in many ways with the rhetorical situation of the Paul's implied audiences in Roman Corinth. At the same time, this passage of 1 Corinthians 15, like any other part of the Scriptures, raises the question of how it speaks to the situation of believers in Africa today.

6.3.1 Africans Reading the Bible Intertextually: 1 Corinthians 15

For Paul's reading of Scripture and his use of *Ioudaios* concepts from an intertextual perspective would introduce an African audience into the important myriad and inner-textual world of the writer. The question: Is it still valid to read Scriptures as Paul or other New Testament writers did? receives a positive nod under the lens of intertextual analysis. The value of intertextuality, as a literary methodology, is its potential to work in tandem with other literary readings of Scripture that empower third-world readers and shift the power away from Western-dominated and limiting approaches (see Ogden, 2002: 167–177; Sugirtharajah, 1993, 2001; Wendland, 2002). Throughout this research, one of the objectives I have endeavoured to demonstrate was how as a method for engaging Paul's use of Scripture and *Ioudaios* concepts, intertextuality has enabled the study to explicate the deep-seated centrality of Paul's *Ioudaios* and ethnocultural nested identities so that they were pivotal for his rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 15. In addition, the intertextual study has demonstrated that Paul's objectives, among other things, in engaging with the Scriptures of Israel was to re-

evaluate and re-shape the identity formation of his gentiles-in-Christ implied audiences (see Chapter 3). This gentiles-in-Christ identity formation, I must reiterate, was one of affirmation and not colonizing nor secessionist. It was one of community and not self-interest. And finally, it was one that sought to bring the once “other” into the “universal” unity in Christ, both God’s Israel and the *ethne* uniquely belonging to equal partakers as children of Abraham with a common redemptive history.

This objective made it necessary that Paul addressed such an important matter as the resurrection since, for Paul, this identity in Christ is not just for the living, but also, for those who have died. Therefore, any other teaching that seeks to circumvent the verity of the resurrection breaks community and breaks this identity formation in Christ. *Ioudaios* concepts such as Christ as ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων that Paul uses are not just reflective of Christ’s image but also equally, function as reflexive metaphors on the fate of his implied audiences who are part of the whole harvest. If they exclude Christ, they inadvertently excluded themselves. Therefore, in verse 28, ἵνα ἧ ὁ θεὸς [τὰ] πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, a *Ioudaios* conceptualization, becomes an emphatic statement in Paul’s rhetoric signaling what the God of Israel will accomplish through Christ’s resurrection. Read from an intertextual context, this statement draws on Paul’s *Ioudaios* background as also Keener emphasizes, that “when Jewish writers like Paul used such language, they meant... that God is creator and ruler of all (Sirach 43:27)” (2014: 493). It is therefore, in my perspective, an emphatic statement of both ontic and eschatological importance for his implied audience and their sense of community and belonging in their identity formation.

Can Africans, today, read the Scriptures as Paul (or the New Testament writers) did, in such an enriching intertextual ethos? As this research has shown, once again, the answer is in the strong affirmative. The question and the exploration of this approach goes beyond a question of “can” and becomes a necessary hermeneutical exercise and tool for African readers. The

question of authentic African Christian identities already raised in Chapters 2 and 3 of this research, (identities devoid of mimesis of Western, foreign and colonizing categories that hold Africans back from the realization of their community, both socio-politically and culturally), comes to the fore here. From my context as an African, I have been motivated to pursue this research subject because of the affirmative categories I have discovered projected from the identity formation of both Paul and his implied audiences.

These affirmative categories are necessary for Christianity in Africa because of the negativity the continent has suffered in the past through political colonization and Western ethnocentrism propagated through the 19th century missionary enterprise. This is how Tarus & Lowery (2017) have expressed this historical problem:

African theologies of identity emerged out of the search for identity and meaning in Africa. The need for a definition of what it means to be African (in Africa or in diaspora) arose out of the various facets of life in Africa such as the challenges of the missionary enterprise, the colonial experience especially the colonialists' ethnocentric attitudes toward Africans, the formation of new governments after colonialism ended (1954–1994), the post-colonial land resettlement programs, which uprooted some people from their ancestral lands; the reality of apartheid in South Africa, the challenges of modernization and globalization, rural to urban migrations, the embrace of foreign languages (English, French, Arabic, and Portuguese) at the expense of indigenous languages, the loss of tradition, and the various challenges of poverty and diseases that ravage the African continent (2017: 307).

Kwame Bediako (1999) diagnosed this malady in his work *Theology and Identity: The Impact of Culture upon Christian Thought in the Second Century and in Modern Africa* to which I will return below.¹²⁴ The consequence of Western imperialism and Afropessimism has been that the Bible is often regarded and read as a foreign book (“a white man’s book”) by many (even some Christians) in Africa. And this misconception is often partly aided by the foreign and Westernized methods of reading imposed on it and manifested through contemporary church liturgical, academic and homiletic practices. Since the impact of the 18th and 19th century Western missionary enterprise, the church in Africa has lived on largely

¹²⁴ Keith Ferdinando has written a reflection and a critique on Bediako’s publication (see Ferdinando, 2007).

borrowed theology and theological methods. And indeed, African Christian scholars such as John Mbiti, Jesse Mugambi, Vincent Mulago and Kwame Bediako, to mention just a few, have in the past decades pondered and discussed these dire issues, often exploring apologetic and theological solutions. Bediako, for example, agrees that the African religious past and identity(-ies) were thrown out and lost in the course of this colonial era and European missionary enterprise in Africa (see Bediako, 1999: 225–266). In his works he has posited continuities between the African religious past and the Christian faith as possible ways toward recovering our identity(ies) as African Christians (see Bediako, 1999, 2013, 2014). Among the scholars who have critiqued the methods and theology of identity posited by Bediako and other African Christian scholars, Keith Ferdinando's (2007) article is worth noting here. However, with all the variety of views and critiques, it can be emphasized that all these scholars generally agree, in differing approaches that the New Testament writers, typically Paul, in their cross-cultural mission to the Gentiles are worth emulating. For example, Bediako has stated the following:

The great significance, then, of Paul in the early mission, and hence for all cross-cultural Christian mission, consists in his ministry as a facilitator and enabler for the Gentiles. It is Paul above all who ensured that Gentiles would feel at home in the Gospel, on the same terms as Jews like himself were accepted, that is, by faith in Christ Jesus and not by submitting to Judaizing demands for circumcision... Thus the great achievement of Paul in the early Christian mission was to have worked tirelessly to secure the conditions in which the Christian self-understanding of Gentiles could develop and flourish in the subsequent Christian centuries (1999: 249).

Similarly, Ferdinando has relied largely on the New Testament's testimony to make his recommendations on what should constitute conversion and continuities between Christian faith and the African religious past (see Ferdinando, 2007: 124–143). It must be stated though that Ferdinando's perspective refutes a large part of Bediako's propositions (and therefore also those of Mbiti and Idowu) concerning the identity of African Christians drawn from their religious past. He is basically of the position that the Gospel on its own is sufficient to give Christians in Africa their identity but not their religious past (see Ferdinando, 2007: 131–

143). Unfortunately, as insightful and sometimes indefinite as his discussions and conclusions are, such a proposition on his part seems to neglect that the past is not less important than the present and the future especially for African Christians. Furthermore, it is not enough to claim to supplant the African religious past with an Israelite one from the Old Testament, assigning divine immunity to the latter and downplaying the possibility of a divine hand in the former (see Ferdinando, 2007: 139–143).

Nonetheless, these observations I have made, seek to re-state the importance of the on-going dialogue on the subject of identity and the Christian faith in Africa. I identify with an important assessment Obeng (1997) has made concerning Africa and its cultural-religious past. I quote him at length:

The mention of African culture raises in missionary minds, idol worship, fetishism, human sacrifices, outmoded beliefs and practices. No wonder they are quick to reject African beliefs and practices. Cultures are not static, always changing and always adapting to new situations. African culture has changed through contact with the wider world. Colonization and westernization have brought with them aspects that have transformed African culture in radical ways. It is that changing culture, that culture which has developed after colonization and embracing all our post-independence experiences, it is that culture which should determine our priorities in any attempt to re-read the Bible within the African context. African culture, therefore, includes our experiences of extreme poverty, wanton corruption in high places, ethnic conflicts, civil wars, refugee problems, problems related to street children, single parents, and break up families, dictatorship, oppression of women and democracy related issues. In addition to all these we must include the moral values which are entrenched in the African beliefs and practices which have survived in our sense of community and family spirit, sense of the sacred, respect for life etc. (1997: 17).

And so just like Obeng, whatever academic journey that Mbiti, Mulago, Idowu, Walls, Bediako and all other scholars of African Christianity and advocates of authentic African Christian identity(-ies) pursued, as Africans we have not “arrived”. Both present and future scholars who still see the continent drowning from the continuing negative effects of colonialism, Western financial monopoly, gross corruption, poverty, ravaging of Africa’s rainforest and natural resources, diseases and tribal conflicts, must not downplay the importance of pursuing approaches by which the Scriptures can speak to and shape authentic African Christian identity(-ies) and concerns (see Kinoti & Waliggo, 1997; Obeng, 1997). As

much as we are Christians, we are also truly Africans, and it is important for African Christianity to negotiate these nested identities as Paul negotiated that of his gentiles-in-Christ (see Hays, 2011).

In this research, as far as the religious past of the African is concerned, the element of language is an essential component and can become a fruitful tool in the process of contextual Bible reading. This study appeals to a focus on mother-tongue linguistic (rhetorical) reading of the Scriptures that keeps in mind the intertextual networks of, in this case, Paul's use of Scripture and *Ioudaios* concepts. African readers of the Scriptures need to ask questions such as: how does the dating of a book, or the historical background of a text, or of its recipients or of the author or even detailed exegesis of its past *alone*, enable and empower African Christian readers at all levels (both academia and grassroots as a whole) in the existential realities of their living? Literary methods such as intertextuality can project the principles, moral and spiritual (liturgical) virtues the Scriptures advocate, while avoiding the alienating elements that other historical-critical methods may impose through their objective historicity approaches (see Moyise, 2009). Contemporary African Christian readers would benefit from the text and literature of the Scriptures before them, while at the same time the network of intertextual relations in the text can preserve the integrity of the text while bringing them closer into the hearts and homes of Africans.¹²⁵ Other than this, most historical-critical methods on their own project, for example, ancient Mediterranean and Greco-Roman settings (political, social and cultural), emphasize foreign and disconnected images to contemporary African readers who quite often have no idea what these settings represent today. African Christians must imagine and see themselves in the texts of Scripture. Are contemporary African Christians bothered about Western-shaped theologies and

¹²⁵ On the subject of preserving the integrity of the text, I recall here a guided remark by Stefan Alkier: "For methodological reasons and reasons pertaining to the ethics of interpretation, one must perform intratextual analyses of the texts to be brought together before any intertextual work commences" (2009: 10).

doctrines churned from Scriptures, whether they are centred on the cohesiveness of the doctrine of the Trinity, or the substantiation or transubstantiation of Communion elements and so on?¹²⁶ It goes without saying that there are questions and answers that African Christians search for from Scripture, that provoke African Christian theologies, that historical-critical methodologies and other Western-shaped readings of Scripture fail to offer or even legitimise (see Obeng, 1997: 14–24). Obeng has boldly, but rightly, iterated that “there have been calls for the rejection of outmoded African customs and practices. The same should hold for beliefs and teachings in the Bible which have no relevance for African Christians” (1997: 17). Intertextual analysis and readings of the Scriptures have the potential to enable contemporary African readers to own the text as their own, and identify themselves in the voices of the authors or recipients or narrators or protagonists or antagonists in the text. Hence, an awareness and activation of authentic African Christian identities is fundamental to this overhauling of the old inherited systems. And since African Christians need to read the Scriptures in their own mother-tongue languages, it is important that Scripture translation is undertaken with literary methodologies such as intertextuality (and interdiscursivity) at the centre.¹²⁷

Of course, for those who might look at intertextuality as an open-ended methodology that might open the floodgates for all kinds of “illegitimate” readings of Scripture (even though no one reads Scriptures without their own biases), scholarly works by advocates of this method have proven the opposite (see Alkier, 2009; Beale, 2012; Ciampa & Rosner, 2007; Hays, 1989; Moyise, 2002, 2009). For the purposes of this section, Stefan Alkier’s (2009)

¹²⁶ These questions echo Andrew Walls’ (1996) short allegory in the opening chapter of his book *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith* (see Walls, 1996: 3–7).

¹²⁷ It is important to navigate the nuances of the topic of how intertextuality and Paul’s use of Scripture can benefit African Christianity. In the next section I explore this issue.

presentation of three potential ways of how one can engage in intertextual readings and exegesis of the Scriptures are useful, but space does not allow for further investigation here.

6.3.2 Africans Translating the Scriptures Intertextually: 1 Corinthians 15

A second question flows from the above discussions: Can Bible translators and translation teams engage Bible translation with an intertextual perspective, and to what end? Additionally, how can translation teams illustrate and explicate intertextual networks and concepts that authors like Paul weave into the texts? Furthermore, the introspection that Bible agencies in Africa need to undertake, includes but is not limited to the following: Has Scripture translation betrayed Africa? Has the Bible become a tool of colonization and psychological enslavement in Africa?

These latter two questions are a tragedy if their answer is in the affirmative. Definitely some scholars have hinted at this tragedy as far as translation activity of the Bible in Africa is concerned.¹²⁸ R.S. Sugirtharajah has expressed the following sentiments: “Bible Translation has long been implicated in diverse imperialist projects in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and South America. In the colonial context, translation acted as mediating agency between conquest and conversion” (2002: 156). Musa W. Dube, as well, has levelled one such critique of the history of translation activity in Africa. This is her verdict of the narrative: “the story of biblical translation into various cultures is therefore intertwined with this history of colonial history, which stands in the same line with the current form of globalization” (2016: 159; see also Ciampa, 2012: 309–310). The fact that for Musa W. Dube Bible translation, especially in the last 200 years, is guilty of association with imperialism and colonialism and decisively, “these last two hundred years were centuries of modern colonialism” (Dube, 2016: 159)

¹²⁸ On the other hand, one scholarly work which has sought to make a positive and apologetic case for Bible translation and the missionary enterprise is that by Lamin Sanneh (2009).

compounds the task of translation work especially in contemporary Africa. Nonetheless, she has made relevant radical proposals including the need to review translation theories used in Africa imported from the West, the manner of training of translators and translation consultants in Africa and target communities for translation projects who should not become objects of colonization (see Dube, 2016: 160).

Dube highlights the importance of the task of Bible translation as an activity that has been and can continue to become a tool for usurping a people's identity and "not only colonization, but also patriarchal colonization" (2016: 161). The call for a revisiting of long-accepted translation approaches and methodologies especially for the contexts of Africa and other two-thirds world cannot be overemphasized (see Sugirtharajah, 2002). For this research, Ciampa (2012b: 308–316) sets the tone for discovering how Paul's use of Scripture (and for that matter, intertextuality) can enable translators to navigate away from the negative categories of translation. He also acknowledges the power struggle and colonizing effect that Bible translation can have on the "powerless" whiles promoting the ideologies of the "powerful" (see Ciampa, 2012: 309–310).¹²⁹

The outcomes of the intertextual analysis in Chapter 5 have confirmed to us Paul's active and conscious activity of "re-translating" and reinterpreting the Scriptures of Israel and *Ioudaios* concepts. The observations made from the chapter refute the perception that Paul is arbitrary with his use of the Scriptures of Israel.

Instead, through an intertextual reading, Paul's reading and proficient use of *Ioudaios* concepts is revealed. Also, the discussions from the first section of this chapter have demonstrated how such intertextual activity shows Paul's sense of negotiating the "powers"

¹²⁹ Ciampa (2012b) has expressed the following: "Contemporary approaches to translation also tend to be more fully aware of the problems caused by ideological or cultural bias or distortion in the past and more committed to translating in ways that do not promote injustice or alienation or serve cultural agendas, especially those of the powerful at the expense of the powerless" (2012b: 310).

of identity formation between *Ioudaios* and Hellenistic audiences. The resolution is that, if it is possible and expedient for African Christians to read the Scriptures as Paul and other New Testament writers did (this case has been made above), then it is also possible and expedient to draw from his intertextual activity of “re-translating” and reinterpreting for his cross-cultural gentile missions. In order to respond to the challenges raised by scholars such as Dube (2016), I will interact with certain conclusive statements and observations from Ciampa (2012b) because his article provides a good sounding board to assist in framing the objectives, recommendations and conclusions of this chapter. Ciampa’s work includes a range of questions that are relevant also to my study:

When Paul quotes and argues from Scripture, to what extent does he domesticate his language, and to what extent does he foreignize it? Does he seek to enrich the vocabulary and linguistic repertoire of his readers, or does he translate the terms and concepts so that they can be assimilated by people who are not familiar with the idioms and terminology found in the Jewish Scriptures? (2012b: 314–315)

In Chapter 5, from the intertextual analysis, it was ascertained that Paul did all of the above. For example, Paul’s conscious choice of the verbal forms of ἐγείρω demonstrated categories of both domesticating and “foreignizing” elements. As already explained from Chapter 5, Paul avoids the more common Hellenistic expression ἀνάστασις for reasons of possible misinterpretation by his Hellenistic audience. Yet his choice of ἐγείρω, even though drawn from the corpus of the intertestamental or apocryphal era, indicates what Ciampa (2012b) has described in the questions above. His audiences would be familiar with the verb but nonetheless, their “vocabulary and linguistic repertoire” would be enriched with *Ioudaios* conceptualization in their mother tongue. The same can be said about Paul’s use of ὄφθη, ὑποτάσσω, ἄφρων and so on. In the case of his direct citations and allusions, 1 Corinthians 15 verse 27 and its pericope set an example of how Paul engages these references from Psalms 8 and 110 (in verse 25) to interpret the identity of Christ in the light of the resurrection (see also the analysis under verse 45-49). As the prime catalyst and agent of the resurrection, it was

important that Paul wove his rhetoric with Christ at the central focus. This approach on Paul's part is addressed in Ciampa's (2012b) remark that:

Paul is teaching his Gentile readers to use Jewish and scriptural vocabulary, but he is simultaneously transforming that vocabulary by using it in ways that will be new and challenging to his Jewish brothers as well (2012b: 316).

I will complement Ciampa's observation by acknowledging the nuance that, with the motive of accommodating his audience and not perpetuating any colonization or supersessionist categories, Paul is teaching these *Ioudaios* conceptualizations and "scriptural vocabulary" which he has transformed linguistically and translated into the mother tongue of his audience, the prevailing Hellenistic language of his day. He engages these concepts in their own language being selective and incisive with his rhetoric, but nonetheless, drawing them into a deeper search and exploration of their meaning through the Scriptures.

It is crucial to appreciate how Paul's use of Scripture and *Ioudaios* concepts and expressions addresses both his Gentiles-in-Christ audiences and *Ioudaioi* in diverse ways, because of the craft of his translation, redefinition and reposition of them. In the discourse, there are instances where he drew equally on Hellenistic thought-categories as well, for example verses 29, 33 and 39-41, which provide more instances of domesticating his vocabulary (see Ciampa, 2012b: 316).

These recognizable identity and power negotiations that Paul demonstrates consciously in his use of the Scriptures of Israel and *Ioudaios* concepts and expressions, distancing his cross-cultural mission from any forms of perpetuating colonization or supplanting a people's identity, should motivate contemporary Bible translation activity (in Africa) to take bold steps and decisions to employ ideological methodologies that have the identity(-ies) and multifaceted contexts of African Christian audiences at the centre (cf. Dube, 2016: 170–171).

Of course, there are certain circles where Paul (his rhetoric) and use of the Scriptures of Israel have been conceived as hegemonic and even colonizing; promoting negative ideologies of depriving women's rights, justifying slavery and so on. There are always also instances that Paul's Scripture activity will continue to garner criticism (cf. Punt, 2020: 392–393). Nonetheless, the examples, provisions and recommendations made in this careful research can provide nodes for navigating such murky propositions.

The final question that must be addressed is the recommendations on how intertextuality (and/or interdiscursivity) can be used to empower African Christian readers of the Scriptures. In some current Bible versions, cross-referencing has been used primarily to draw readers' attention to direct citations and sometimes allusions. However, this approach fails as it unconsciously places these citations on the periphery and most readers tend to ignore them. It also fails because it is limited to direct citations and (seldom indirectly to) allusions. This research has attempted to show that Paul does not rely only on citations and allusions but additionally, that he introduces concepts and terminologies that have intertextual networks with other texts or themes in the Scriptures of Israel. These intertextual concepts and terminologies must be engaged as well during translation activity.¹³⁰ In my own current perception, I recommend a system where a standardized color-coding system could be adapted by Bible translation agencies to reflect and illuminate standardized or uniquely context-relevant intertextual echoes, idioms and concepts. Once these have been marked out in the Bibles, endnotes or glossaries (not dictionary-purposed) to serve as Bible helps for contemporary readers. This recommendation may not be necessary for what is identified as direct citations since they are mostly identified in quotation marks or sometimes blocked-cited in some bible versions.

¹³⁰One can refer to the thesis work done on this by Dale R. Hoskins (2017) who develops "textual and paratextual strategies" (2017: viii) for translators and translation teams to engage more with intertextuality in the Scriptures and enrich readers' access to them.

6.4 Conclusion

Paul's *Ioudaios* background should not be overlooked in the reading and translation of his writings, as this research has attempted to demonstrate. In making a case that Paul's nested identity as *Ioudaios* should be a central locus for understanding him, this study indicated that he actively engaged the Scriptures of his ancestors. In his engagement with the Scriptures, Paul employed *Ioudaios* conceptualizations that must be engaged in translation activity.

The case I am making is that Paul did depend on his *Ioudaios* ethnocultural idioms and conceptualizations and therefore, translation projects in Africa need to look beyond "western" dominant translations (English, French, Spanish etc.) and even further beyond New Testament Greek semantics but must go on to identify the potential *Ioudaios* intertextual networks manifested in the texts, and when these have been identified their translation should have a literary intertextual/interdiscursive approach that can "illuminate" these conceptualizations, bearing in mind the thought-categories of the target cultures (see Hoskins, 2017).

Again, Paul's objective for his use of *Ioudaios* conceptualizations had no colonizing intentions because he still maintained firmly that his gentile audiences were not *Ioudaios* but gentiles-in-Christ. Their common story with the people of Israel is a reality only because of the one "spiritual family" that Christ has brought both into, but both remain identifiably unique; hence the emphasis: that Scripture translation and reading in Africa can reflect both the universality of our fellowship with the body of Christ, and yet, holistically, our unique cultural and literary context as Africans.

Paul being *Ioudaios* and communicating in the Hellenistic mother tongue of his audiences is a sign of "no colonizing effect" on his part towards his audiences. He came to them neither speaking in any foreign language or culture, nor forcing them to speak or embody such

cultures. On the contrary, he resisted such injunctions popularly perpetuated by those known as the Judaizers. As challenging as it may have been, for the sake of the contents of his Gospel, communicating *Ioudaios* conceptualizations in the Hellenistic mother tongue of his day is a step further to upholding the identity of his gentile audiences. He identified local Hellenistic idioms that shared meanings with these *Ioudaios* conceptualizations (with the help of the Greek translated Scriptures) in order to “reposition” the Gospel and as well the perceptions of his multifaceted audiences.

My emphasis in this research is that contemporary readers and translators of the Bible in Africa should acknowledge and appreciate these nuances. We should neither represent Paul’s use of the Hellenistic mother tongue as “Christian” nor as a sign of his abandoning his *Ioudaios* ethno-culture, and also, not as his lack of proficiency in the Hebrew/Aramaic renditions of the Scriptures of Israel (see Chapters 2 and 3 for these discussions). We should not, subsequently, leave the exegesis and translation of Pauline texts at the Hellenistic nor historical-critical level, but should rather incorporate the centrality of his *Ioudaios* background especially from an intertextual perspective.

This final chapter has reviewed and shown the immense task that still remains for African Christian scholars, Bible translators and readers of the Scriptures in as far as the matter of authentic African Christian identities and mother tongue exegesis/interpretations are concerned, redeeming Scripture translation in Africa from notions of colonization and revisiting the paradigm of Paul’s use of the Scriptures of Israel with the objective of shaping our own contemporary African religious past. Paul’s final words to his implied audience must still echo to us today: Ὡστε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί, ἐδραῖοι γίνεσθε, ἀμετακίνητοι, περισσεύοντες ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ τοῦ κυρίου πάντοτε, εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ κόπος ὑμῶν οὐκ ἔστιν κενὸς ἐν κυρίῳ (1 Cor. 15:58 NA²⁸).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abasciano, B.J. 2007. Diamonds in the Rough: A Reply to Christopher Stanley concerning the Reader Competency of Paul's Original Audiences. *Novum Testamentum*. 49(2):153–183.
- Adams, S.A. 2008. Paul the Roman Citizen: Roman Citizenship in the Ancient World and its Importance for Understanding Acts 22:22-29. In *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*. S.E. Porter (Ed.), Leiden: Brill. 309–326.
- Agha, A. 2005. Introduction: Semiosis across Encounters. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 15(1):1–5.
- Aichele, G. & Phillips, G.A. 1995. Introduction: Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis. In *Intertextuality and the Bible*. G. Aichele & G.A. Phillips (Eds.), (Semeia no. 69/70). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. 7–18.
- Albl, M.C. 1999. “*And Scripture Cannot Be Broken*”: *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*. V. Nov.TSup 96. Boston: Brill.
- Alkier, S. 2009. Intertextuality and the Semiotics of Biblical Texts. In *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. R.B. Hays, S. Alkier, & Leroy.A. Huizenga (Eds.), Waco: Baylor University Press. 3–21.
- Allen, G. 2000. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Alter, R. & Kermode, F. (Eds.) 1987. *The literary guide to the Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Asher, J.R. 2001. Σπειρεται: Paul's Anthropogenic Metaphor in 1 Corinthians 15:42-44. *Journal of Biblical Studies*. 120(1):101–122.
- Aune, D.E. 1993. Religions, Greco-Roman. In *Dictionary of Paul And His Letters, A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, & D.G. Reid (Eds.) Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 786–796.
- Bartesaghi, M. & Noy, C. 2015. Interdiscursivity. In *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*. First ed. K. Tracy, C. Ilie, & T. Sandel (Eds.), New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons. 1–6.
- Barton, J. 1998. Historical-critical approaches. In *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation*. J. Barton (Ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 9–20.

- Bates, M.W. 2012. Beyond Hays's Echoes of the Scripture in the Letters of Paul: A Proposed Diachronic Intertextuality with Romans 10:16 as a Test Case. In *Paul and Scriptures: Extending the Conversation*. C.D. Stanley (Ed.), Atlanta: SBL. 263–291.
- Beale, G.K. 2012. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Becker, A.H. & Reed, A.Y. (Eds.) 2007. *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Bediako, G.M. 2000. Primal Religion and Christian faith: Antagonists or soul-mates? *Journal of African Christian Thought*. 3(1):12–16.
- Bediako, G.M. 2009. Old Testament Religion as Primal Substructure of Christianity: Questions and Issues. *Journal of African Christian Thought*. 12(1):3–7.
- Bediako, K. 1994. Understanding African Theology in the 20th Century. *Themelios*. 20(1):14–20.
- Bediako, K. 1999. *Theology and Identity: The Impact of Culture upon Christian Thought in the Second Century and in Modern Africa*. Oxford: Regnum.
- Bediako, K. 2013. *Jesus in Africa: The Christian Gospel in African History and Experience*. 2nd ed. Akropong-Akuapem: Regnum Africa.
- Bediako, K. 2014. *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion*. Akropong-Akuapem: Regnum Africa.
- Bitzer, L.F. 1968. The Rhetorical Situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*. 1(1):1–14.
- Blomberg, C.L. 2010. *A Handbook of New Testament Exegesis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Bock, D.L. 2007. *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament: Acts*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Bongmba, E.K. (Ed.) 2016. *The Routledge Companion to Christianity in Africa*. New York: Routledge.
- Bookidis, N. 2005. Religion in Corinth: 146 B.C.E to 100 C.E. In *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. D. Schowalter & S.J. Friesen (Eds.), Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 141–164.

- Bornkamm, G. 1964. μυστήριον, μύεω. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Electronic ed. ed. V. 4. G. Kittel, G.W. Bromiley, & G. Friedrich (Eds.), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 802–828.
- Bruce, F.F. 1993. Paul in Acts and Letters. In *Dictionary of Paul And His Letters, A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. G.F. Hawthorne, D.G. Reid, & R.P. Martin (Eds.), Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 679–692.
- Bullo, S. 2017. Investigating intertextuality and interdiscursivity in evaluation: the case of conceptual blending. *Language and Cognition*. 5:1–19. DOI: 10.1017/langcog.2017.5.
- Campbell, W.S. 2012. Gentile Identity and Transformation in Christ According to Paul. In *The Making of Christianity Conflicts, Contacts, and Constructions: Essays in Honor of Bengt Holmberg*. M. Zetterholm & S. Byrskog (Eds.), Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 23–55.
- Carson, D.A. & Beale, G.K. (Eds.) 2007. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Ciampa, R.E. 2012a. Approaching Paul’s Use of Scripture in Light of Translation Studies. In *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*. C.D. Stanley (Ed.), Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. 293–318.
- Ciampa, R.E. 2012b. Approaching Paul’s Use of Scripture in Light of Translation Studies. In *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*. C.D. Stanley (Ed.) Atlanta: SBL. 293–318.
- Ciampa, R.E. & Rosner, B.S. 2007. 1 Corinthians. In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. G.K. Beale & D.A. Carson (Eds.), Grand Rapids: Baker Academic. 695–752.
- Clark, G. 2004. *Christianity and Roman Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collins, A.Y. 2012. Baptism and the Formation of Identity. In *The Making of Christianity Conflicts, Contacts, and Constructions: Essays in Honor of Bengt Holmberg*. M. Zetterholm & S. Byrskog (Eds.), Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 57–73.
- Collins, J.J. 2005. *The Bible after Babel: Historical Criticism in a Postmodern Age*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- Concannon, C.W. 2014. *“When You Were Gentiles”*: Specters of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul’s Corinthian Correspondence. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dahl, N.A. 1977. *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Davies, W.D. 1980. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Delling, G. 1964a. ἄρχω, ἀρχή, ἀπαρχή, ἀρχαῖος, ἀρχηγός, ἄρχων. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Electronic ed. ed. V. 1. G. Kittel, G.W. Bromiley, & G. Friedrich, Eds. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 478–489.
- Delling, G. 1964b. τάσσω, τάγμα, ἀνατάσσω, ἀποτάσσω, διατάσσω, διαταγή, ἐπιταγή, προστάσσω, ὑποτάσσω, ὑποταγή, ἀνυπότακτος, ἄτακτος (ἀτάκτως), ἀτακτέω. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Electronic ed. ed. V. 8. G. Kittel, G.W. Bromiley, & G. Friedrich (Eds.), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 27–48.
- Dube, M.W. 2016. Christianity and Translation in the Colonial Context. In *The Routledge Companion to Christianity in Africa*. E.K. Bongmba (Ed.), New York: Routledge. 156–172.
- Duling, D.C. 2003. *The New Testament: History, Literature and Social Context*. 4th ed. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Dunn, J.D.G. Ed. 2003. *The Cambridge Companion to St Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dunn, J.D.G. 2006. *The Partings of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. Second ed. London: SCM.
- Dunn, J.D.G. 2008. *The New Perspective on Paul*. Revised ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Eisenbaum, P. 2009. *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle*. New York: HarperOne.
- Ekem, J.D.K. 2011. *Early Scriptures of the Gold Coast (Ghana): The Historical, Linguistic, and Theological Settings of the Ga, Twi, Mfantse, and Ewe Bibles*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Ekem, J.D.K. 2015. *Interpretation of ‘Scripture’ In Some New Testament Documents: Lessons for the Ghanaian Context*. Accra: African Christian.

- Ellis, E.E. 1957. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. London: Oliver and Boyd.
- Engberg-Pedersen, T. 2002. *Paul and Stoics*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Ferdinando, K. 2007. Christian Identity in the African Context: Reflections on Kwame Bediako's Theology and Identity. *JETS*. 50(1):121–143.
- Fishbane, M. 1985. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foster, P. 2015. Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament. *JSNT*. 38(1):96–111.
- Fredriksen, P. 2007. What “Parting of the Ways”? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City. In *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. A.H. Becker & A.Y. Reed (Eds.), Minneapolis: Fortress. 35–63.
- Gager, J.G. 2015. *Who Made Early Christianity? The Jewish Lives of the Apostle Paul*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gamble, H. 2000. Literacy and Book Culture. In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. C.A. Evans & S.E. Porter (Eds.), Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 644–648.
- Gatumu, K. wa. 2009. Using Primal Resources to Appropriately the Bible: A Paradigm Shift for Biblical Hermeneutics. *Journal of African Christian Thought*. 12(1):15–21.
- Gladd, B.L. 2009. *Revealing the Mysterion: The Use of Mystery in Daniel and Second Temple Judaism with Its Bearing on First Corinthians*. V. BZNW 16. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Gooch, P.W. 1978. The Ethics of Accommodation: A Study in Paul. *TynBul*. 29:93–117.
- Green, G.L. 2013. Achaia. In *The World of the New Testament: Cultural, Social and Historical Contexts*. J.B. Green & M.L. McDonald (Eds.), Grand Rapids: Baker Academic. 544–556.
- Greene, T.M. 1982. *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Hafemann, S.J. 1993. Corinthians, Letters to The. In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters, A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. G.F. Hawthorne, D.G. Reid, & R.P. Martin (Eds.) Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 164–179.
- Hawthorne, G.F., Martin, R.P. & Reid, D.G. (Eds.) 1993. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters, A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.
- Hays, R.B., Alkier, S. & Huizenga, Leroy.A. (Eds.) 2009. *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Hays, J.D. 2011. Paul and the Multi-Ethnic First-Century World: Ethnicity and Christian Identity. In *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice*. T.J. Burke & B.S. Rosner (Eds.), New York: T&T Clark. 76–87.
- Hays, R.B. 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. London: Yale University Press.
- Hays, R.B. 1997. *First Corinthians*. J.L. Mays, Ed. (Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching). Louisville: John Knox Press.
- Hays, R.B. 1999. The Conversion of the Imagination: Scripture and Eschatology in 1 Corinthians. 45(3):391–412.
- Heil, J.P. 2005. *The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians*. Atlanta: SBL.
- Horrell, D.G. 2004. Domestic Space and Christian Meetings at Corinth: Imagining New Contexts and the Buildings East of the Theatre. *NTS*. 50:349–369.
- Horsley, R.A. 2005. Paul’s Assembly in Corinth: An Alternative Society. In *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. D. Schowalter & S.J. Friesen (Eds.), Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 371–395.
- Hoskins, D.R. 2017. Translating Intertextuality in Scripture. In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Ministry. Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary.
- Jin, D. 2003. *Literary translation: Quest for artistic integrity*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Johnson Hodge, C. 2005. Apostle to the Gentiles: Constructions of Paul’s Identity. *Biblical Interpretation*. 13(3):270–288.
- Johnson Hodge, C. 2007. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Johnson Hodge, C. 2015. The Question of Identity: Gentiles as Gentiles—but also Not—in Pauline Communities. In *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century to the Apostle*. M. Nanos & M. Zetterholm (Eds.), Minneapolis: Fortress. 153–173.
- Keener, C.S. 2012. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. V. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Keener, C.S. 2014. 1 Corinthians. In *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*. Second Edition ed. C.S. Keener (Ed.) Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 459–497.
- Kennedy, G.A. 1984. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Kinoti, H.W. & Waliggo, J.M. (Eds.) 1997. *The Bible in African Christianity: Essays in Biblical Theology*. (African Christianity Series). Nairobi: Acton.
- Lanci, J.R. 2005. The Stones Don't Speak and the Texts Tell Lies: Sacred Sex at Corinth. In *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. D. Schowalter & S.J. Friesen (Eds.), Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 204–220.
- Laver, J. & Mason, I. 2020a. Intertextuality. In *A Dictionary of Translation and Interpreting*. Available: https://www.academia.edu/44324526/A_DICTIONARY_OF-TRANSLATION_AND_INTERPRETING?email_work_card=thumbnail [2020, October 19].
- Laver, J. & Mason, I. 2020b. Interdiscursivity. In *A Dictionary of Translation and Interpreting*. Available: https://www.academia.edu/44324526/A_DICTIONARY_OF-TRANSLATION_AND_INTERPRETING?email_work_card=thumbnail [2020, October 19].
- Lieu, J.M. 2004. *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lieu, J.M. 2016. *Neither Jew nor Greek? Constructing Early Christianity*. Second ed. London: T&T Clark.
- Lim, K.Y. 2017. *Metaphors and Social Identity Formation in Paul's Letters to the Corinthians*. Eugene: Pickwick.
- Lincicum, D. 2008. Paul and the Testimonia: Quo Vademus. *JETS*. 51(2):297–308.
- Longenecker, R.N. 1975. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- Lukaszewski, A.L., Dubis, M. & Blakley, J.T. 2011. *The Lexham Syntactic Greek New Testament, SBL Edition: Expansions and Annotations*. Electronic ed. ed. Bellingham: Lexham.
- Lynwood Smith, D. 2015. *Into the World of the New Testament: Greco-Roman and Jewish Texts and Contexts*. London: T&T Clark.
- Malherbe, A.J. 1989. *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Malina, B.J. & Pilch, J.J. 2006. *A Social-Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Mason, S. 2007. Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History. *Journal for the Study of Judaism*. 38(4–5):457–512.
- Mbiti, J.S. 1968. Christianity and East African Culture and Religion. *Dini na Mila*. 30(1):1–6.
- McKay, N. 2013. Status Update: The Many Faces of Intertextuality in New Testament Study. *Religion & Theology*. 20(1–2):84–106.
- McRay, J.R. 2000. Corinth. In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. C.A. Evans & S.E. Porter (Eds.), Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 227–231.
- Meggitt, J.J. 1998. Paul, Poverty and Survival. In *Studies of the New Testament and Its World*. J. Barclay, J. Marcus, & J. Riches (Eds.), Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Metzger, B.M. 1994. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, second edition a companion volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (4th rev. ed.)*. Electronic Ed. ed. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Michaelis, W. 1964. ὁράω, εἶδον, βλέπω, ὀπτάνομαι, θεάομαι, θεωρέω, ἄορατος, ὀρατός, ὄρασις, ὄραμα, ὀπτασία, αὐτόπτης, ἐπόπτης, ἐποπτεύω, ὀφθαλμός. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. V. 5. G. Kittel, G.W. Bromiley, & G. Friedrich (Eds.), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 315–382.
- Miller, D.M. 2010. The Meaning of Ioudaios and its Relationship to Other Group Labels in Ancient “Judaism”. *Currents in Biblical Research*. 9(1):98–126.
- Miller, D.M. 2012. Ethnicity Comes of Age: An Overview of Twentieth-Century Terms for Ioudaios. *Currents in Biblical Research*. 10(2):293–311.
- Miller, D.M. 2014. Ethnicity, Religion and the Meaning of Ioudaios in Ancient “Judaism”. *Currents in Biblical Research*. 12(2):216–265.

- Miller, J.C. 2011. Paul and Ethnicity: Reframing the Categories. In *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice*. T.J. Burke & B.S. Rosner (Eds.), New York: T&T Clark. 37–50.
- Mitchell, M.M. 1991. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Moyise, S. 2001. *The Old Testament in the New Testament: An Introduction*. London: Continuum.
- Moyise, S. 2002. Intertextuality and Biblical Studies: A Review. *Verbum et Ecclesia*. 23(2):418–431.
- Moyise, S. 2009. Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament. In *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. R.B. Hays, S. Alkier, & Leroy.A. Huizenga (Eds.), Waco: Baylor University Press. 23–31.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 1996. *Paul: A Critical Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 2002. *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*. 3rd Revised & Expanded ed. Collegeville: The Liturgical.
- Nanos, M.D. & Zetterholm, M. Eds. 2015. *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Nanos, M.D. 2002. What Was at Stake in Peter's "Eating With Gentiles" at Antioch? In *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. 282–318.
- Nanos, M.D. 2017a. Paul's Relationship to Torah in Light of His Strategy "to Become Everything to Everyone" (1 Corinthians 9:19-23). In *Reading Corinthians and Philippians within Judaism: Collected Essays of Mark D. Nanos*. V. 4. Eugene: Cascade. 52–92.
- Nanos, M.D. 2017b. The Polytheist Identity of the "Weak," and Paul's Strategy to "Gain" Them: A New Reading of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1. In *Reading Corinthians and Philippians within Judaism: Collected Essays of Mark D. Nanos*. V. 4. Eugene: Cascade. 3–35.
- Neusner, J. 1982. *Formative Judaism: Religious, Historical and Literary Studies*. Chico: Scholars.

- Obeng, E.A. 1997. The Use of Biblical Critical Methods in Rooting the Scriptures in Africa. In *The Bible in African Christianity: Essays in Biblical Theology*. H.W. Kinoti & J.M. Waliggo (Eds.), Nairobi: Acton. 8–24.
- Oepke, A. 1964a. ἀνίστημι, ἐξανίστημι, ἀνάστασις, ἐξανάστασις. In *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*. Electronic ed. ed. V. 1. G. Kittel, G.W. Bromiley, & G. Friedrich (Eds.), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 368–372.
- Oepke, A. 1964b. ἐγείρω, ἔγερσις, ἐξεγείρω, γρηγορέω (ἀγρυπνέω). In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Electronic ed. ed. V. 2. G. Kittel, G.W. Bromiley, & G. Friedrich (Eds.), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 333–339.
- Ogden, G. 2002. Biblical Studies and Bible Translation. In *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference*. T. Wilt (Ed.), Manchester: St. Jerome. 153–177.
- Paige, T. 1993. Philosophy. In *Dictionary of Paul And His Letters, A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 713–718.
- Parsons, M.C. 2008. Acts. In *Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament*. C.H. Talbert & M.C. Parsons (Eds.), Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Pogoloff, S.M. 1992. *Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians*. Atlanta: Scholars.
- Porter, S.E. & Dyer, B.R. (Eds.) 2016. *Paul and Ancient Rhetoric: Theory and Practice in the Hellenistic Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Porter, S.E. 2008a. Paul as Jew, Greek, and Roman: An Introduction. In *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*. V. 5. S.E. Porter (Ed.) (Pauline Studies). Leiden: Brill. 1–6.
- Porter, S.E. 2008b. Paul and his Bible: His Education and Access to the Scriptures of Israel. In *AS IT IS WRITTEN: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. V. SBLSymS 50. S.E. Porter & C.D. Stanley (Eds.), Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. 97–124.
- Porter, S.E. 2008c. Did Paul Speak Latin? In *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*. V. 5. S.E. Porter, (Ed.) (Pauline Studies). Leiden: Brill. 289–308.
- Powell, M.A. 2009. *Introducing the New Testament: A Historical, Literary, and Theological Survey*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Punt, J. 1996. Paul, hermeneutics and the Scriptures of Israel. *Neotestamentica*. 30(2):377–425.

- Punt, J. 2000. Paul and the Scriptures of Israel: How much Hermeneutical Awareness did He Display? *Neotestamentica*. 34(2):311–327.
- Punt, J. 2012. Identity, Memory, and Scriptural Warrant: Arguing Paul’s Case. In *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*. C.D. Stanley (Ed.), Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. 25–53.
- Punt, J. 2020. (Post-) Perspectivally, Paul? *Neotestamentica*. 54(2):373–398.
- Pym, D. 2008. ‘Primal Religions’: Appropriate Religious Designation or Inappropriate Theological Imposition? *Journal of African Christian Thought*. 11(1):60–69.
- Quarshie, B.Y. 2009. Paul and the Primal Substructure of Christianity: Missiological Reflections on the Epistle to the Galatians. *Journal of African Christian Thought*. 12(1):8–14.
- Quarshie, B.Y. 2016. Bible Translation and Interpretation in Africa: Religious, Cultural and Theological Dynamics - Guest Editorial. *Journal of African Christian Thought*. 19(2):1–3.
- Reasoner, M. 1993. Citizenship, Roman and Heavenly. In *Dictionary of Paul And His Letters, A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, & D.G. Reid (Eds.), Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 139–141.
- Reinhartz, A. 2014. *How should one translate the Greek term ioudaios?* Available: marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/vanishing-jews-antiquity-adele-reinhartz/.
- Robinson, B.A. 2005. Fountains and the Formation of Cultural Identity at Roman Corinth. In *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. D. Schowalter & S.J. Friesen, Eds. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 111–140.
- Roetzel, C.J. 1999. *Paul: The Man and the Myth*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Runesson, A. 2015. The Question of Terminology: The Architecture of Contemporary Discussions on Paul. In *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*. M.D. Nanos & M. Zetterholm (Eds.), Minneapolis: Fortress. 53–77.
- Runge, S.E. 2010. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Sanders, E.P. 1983. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish people*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

- Sanders, E.P. 2009. Paul between Judaism and Hellenism. In *St. Paul among the Philosophers*. J.D. Caputo & L.M. Alcoff (Eds.), Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 74–90.
- Sanders, G.D.R. 2005. Urban Corinth: An Introduction. In *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. D. Schowalter & S.J. Friesen (Eds.), Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 11–24.
- Sanneh, L. 2009. *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture*. Revised and Expanded ed. Maryknoll: Orbis.
- Satlow, M.L. 2006. Defining Judaism: Accounting for “Religions” in the Study of Religion. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. 74(4):837–860.
- Satlow, M.L. 2018. Paul’s Scriptures. In *Strength to Strength: Essays in Appreciation of Shaye J.D. Cohen*. M.L. Satlow (Ed.), Providence, Rhode Island: Brown Judaic Studies. 257–273.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. 1987. Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians. *NTS*. 33:386–403.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. 1999. *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Schwartz, S. 2011. How many Judaisms were there? A critique of Neusner and Smith on definition and Mason and Boyarin on categorization. *Journal of Ancient Judaism*. 2(2):208–238.
- Segovia, F.F. & Tolbert, M.A. Eds. 1995a. *Reading from this Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*. V. 1. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Segovia, F.F. & Tolbert, M.A. Eds. 1995b. *Reading from this Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in Global Perspectives*. V. 2. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Segovia, F.F. 1995a. The Text as Other: Towards a Hispanic American Hermeneutic. In *Text & Experience. Towards A Cultural Exegesis of the Bible*. D. Smith-Christopher (Ed.), Biblical Seminar. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 276–298.
- Segovia, F.F. 1995b. “And They Began to Speak in Other Tongues”: Competing Modes of Discourse in Contemporary Biblical Criticism. In *Reading from this Place: Social*

- Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*. V. 1. F.F. Segovia & M.A. Tolbert (Eds.), Minneapolis: Fortress. 1–32.
- Silva, M. 1993. Old Testament in Paul. In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. G.F. Hawthorne, D.G. Reid, & R.P. Martin (Eds.) Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 630–642.
- Smith, J.Z. 1998. Religion, Religions, Religious. In *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. M.C. Taylor (Ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 269–284.
- Smith-Christopher, D. 1995. *Text & Experience: Towards a Cultural Exegesis of the Bible*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Stamps, D.L. 2007. Pauline Letters. In *Dictionary of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation*. London: Routledge. 265–270.
- Stanley, C.D. 1990. Paul and Homer: Greco-Roman Citation Practice in the First Century CE. *Novum Testamentum*. 32(1):48–78.
- Stanley, C.D. 1992. *Paul and the language of Scripture: Citation technique in the Pauline Epistles and contemporary literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stanley, C.D. 1999. “Pearls before Swine”: Did Paul’s Audiences Understand His Biblical Quotations? *Novum Testamentum*. 41(2):124–144.
- Stegemann, W. 1987. War der Apostel Paulus ein römischer Bürger? *ZNW*. 78(3–4):200–229.
- Stegner, W.R. 1993a. Jew, Paul the. In *Dictionary of Paul And His Letters, A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, & D.G. Reid (Eds.) Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 503–511.
- Stegner, W.R. 1993b. Diaspora. In *Dictionary of Paul And His Letters, A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, & D.G. Reid (Eds.), Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 211–213.
- Stendahl, K. 1963. The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West. *Harvard Theological Review*. 56(3):199–215.
- Stowers, S.K. 1994. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stowers, S.K. 2003. Paul and Self-Mastery. In *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. J.P. Sampley (Ed.), Harrisburg: Trinity Press International. 524–550.

- Stowers, S.K. 2015. Paul and the Terrain of Philosophy. *Early Christianity*. 6(2):141–156.
- Strabo. 1960. *The Geography of Strabo*. V. VI (13-14). Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sugirtharajah, R.S. 1993. The Bible and Its Asian Readers. *Biblical Interpretation*. 1(1):54–66.
- Sugirtharajah, R.S. 2001. *The Bible and the Third World. Precolonial, Colonial and Postcolonial Encounters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sugirtharajah, R.S. 2002. *Postcolonial Criticism and Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarus, D.K. & Lowery, S. 2017. African Theologies of Identity and Community: The Contributions of John Mbiti, Jesse Mugambi, Vincent Mulago, and Kwame Bediako. *De Gruyter Open*. (3):305–320. DOI: 10.1515/opth-2017-0024.
- Tate, W.R. 2008. *Biblical Interpretation: An Integrated Approach*. 3rd ed. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Theissen, G. 1982. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Thiselton, A.C. 2000. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Walls, A.F. 1996. *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith*. Maryknoll: Orbis.
- Wendland, E.R. 2002. A Literary Approach to Biblical Text Analysis and Translation. In *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference*. Manchester: St. Jerome. 179–230.
- Wendland, E.R. 2004. *Translating the Literature of Scripture: A Literary-rhetorical Approach to Bible translation*. Dallas: SIL International.
- Wenham, D. 1995. *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Williams III, D.H.H. 2008. Light Giving Sources: Examining the Extent of Scriptural Citation and Allusion Influence in 1 Corinthians. In *Paul: Jew, Greek and Roman*. V. 5. S.E. Porter (Ed.) Leiden: Brill. 7–37.

- Wiseman, J. 1979. Corinth and Rome 1: 228 BC- AD 267. *ANRW*. (2.7.1):438–548.
- Witherington III, B. 1995. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Wright, N.T. 2008. *Surprised by Hope: Rethinking Heaven, the Resurrection, and the Mission of the Church*. New York: HarperCollins e-books.
- Wuellner, W. 1979. Greek Rhetoric and Pauline Argumentation. In *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem Robert M. Grant*. *Théologie Historique*, 54: Editions Beauchesne. 177–188.
- Yamauchi, E.M. 1993. Hellenism. In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters, A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, & D.G. Reid (Eds.), Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 383–388.
- Yamauchi, E.M. 2000. Gnosticism. In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. C.A. Evans & S.E. Porter (Eds.) Downers Grove: InterVarsity. 414–418.
- Yee, G.A. 1995. The Author/Text/Reader and Power: Suggestions for a Critical Framework for Biblical Studies. In *Reading from this Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*. V. 1. F.F. Segovia & M.A. Tolbert (Eds.), Minneapolis: Fortress. 109–118.
- Zetterholm, M. 2009. *Approaches to Paul: A Student's Guide to Recent Scholarship*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Zetterholm, M. 2012. “Will the Real Gentile-Christian Please Stand Up!” Torah and the Crisis of Identity Formation. In *The Making of Christianity Conflicts, Contacts, and Constructions: Essays in Honor of Bengt Holmberg*. M. Zetterholm & S. Byrskog (Eds.), Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 373–393.