

***Imitatio Christi (1 Corinthians 11:1):
How Paul Imitates Jesus Christ in
Dealing with Idol Food (1 Corinthians 8-10)***

SEYOON KIM
FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The importance of the theme of imitatio Christi in Paul has long been recognized in scholarship, especially with regard to the two questions: Pauline ethic and the Jesus-Paul debate. It is argued here that imitatio Christi for Paul, while centered on Christ's self-giving in his incarnation and crucifixion, has the example and teaching of the historical Jesus also in view, and that in dealing with the problem of eidōlōthuta in 1 Cor 8-10 Paul concretely draws some of his guidelines from the historical Jesus' teaching and example.

Key Words: imitation of Christ, "the law of Christ," Paul's use of the Jesus tradition, the Jesus-Paul debate, Pauline ethic, idol food, the weak and the strong

In 1 Cor 11:1 Paul calls the Corinthian Christians to imitate him, basing this call on the fact that he himself is an imitator of Christ. So in the passage Paul is calling them in effect to imitate Christ (cf. also 1 Cor 4:16-17; Phil 3:10, 17; 1 Thess 1:6). The same idea seems to be involved when he sets forth Christ as an example for his readers to follow (Rom 15:1-3, 7; 2 Cor 8:9; Phil 2:5-8). But what of Christ does Paul himself imitate? How does he imitate it? What example of Christ does Paul ask his readers to imitate?

1. THE REDUCTIONISM OF
CRITICAL PROTESTANT SCHOLARSHIP

Critical Protestant scholarship has shown a tendency to affirm that with the thought of *imitatio Christi* Paul has in view only Christ's self-giving in his incarnation and death but not the historical Jesus' teaching and

Author's note: An abbreviated version of this essay was presented as a main paper at the annual meeting of IBR in Toronto on November 23, 2002.

example. So, for example, Otto Merk in his essay "Nachahmung Christi" claims that with his demand for imitation of Christ Paul "refers . . . to the inimitable event of the cross, . . . to the imitation of the pre-existent one, . . . to the 'that' of Jesus' having come, . . . to the saving act of God," but not "to the imitation of the earthly Jesus, his behavior on the basis of (his) word and deed."¹ With this Merk concurs with H. D. Betz, who claims that "what Paul presents as concrete features from the life of Jesus refers to the fact of the incarnation, crucifixion and resurrection of the pre-existent Christ, [but] not to the details from the life of Jesus which are analogous to what the Gospels narrate"² and that for Paul imitation of Christ "is in no way oriented to the ethical and moral example character of the historical Jesus."³

Reviewing the works on the topic of imitation of Christ during the second half of twentieth century, Merk⁴ does note that there have also been attempts to see the importance of the historical Jesus' teaching and example in connection with our topic (E. Larsson, W. de Boer, D. M. Williams, W. G. Kümmel, etc.).⁵ However, he⁶ emphatically aligns himself with H. D. Betz, N. A. Dahl, W. Schrage, V. P. Furnish, J.-F. Collange, A. Schulz, and others,⁷ who all more or less repeat what was essentially the thesis of R. Bultmann: "*Christ is not a model (Vorbild). . . . he can . . . become the model of serving one another. But throughout it is the pre-existent one who is the model.*"⁸

1. Otto Merk, "Nachahmung Christi: Zur ethischen Perspektiven in der paulinischen Theologie," in *Neues Testament und Ethik* (R. Schnackenburg FS; ed. H. Merklein; Freiburg: Herder, 1989), 201; see similar statements also in 202-3,206. Unfortunately Merk does not explain how Paul might have imagined to "imitate" what is "inimitable." Was Paul an alchemist of language?

2. H. D. Betz, *Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi in, Neuen Testament* (BHT 37; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1967), 161.

3. *Ibid.*, 168.

4. Merk, "Nachahmung," 175-78,184.

5. Cf. E. Larsson, *Christus als Vorbild: Eine Untersuchung zu den paulinische', Tauf- und Eikontexten* (ASNU 23; Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1962); W. P. de Boer, *Imitation of Paul* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1962); D. M. Williams, "The Imitation of Christ in Paul with the Special Reference to Paul as Teacher" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1967); W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus and Paulus," in *Heilsgeschehen and Geschichte I: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1933-1964* (Marburger Theologische Studien 3; Marburg: Elwert, 1965), 439-56.

6. Merk, "Nachahmung," 179-90.

7. Betz, *Nachfolge and Nachahmung*; N. A. Dahl, "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (BZNW 21; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1954); W. Schrage, *Ethik des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 198-99; V. F. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), 223; J.-F. Collange, *De Jesus a Paul: L'éthique du Nouveau Testament* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1980); S. Schulz, *Neutestamentliche Ethik* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1987).

8. R. Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Jesus für die Theologie des Paulus," in *Glauber und Verstehen I* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933), 206. See also

This thesis is often accompanied by the contention that Paul did not know or use much of Jesus' teaching and was not interested in his historical person. Of course, R. Bultmann also championed this view.⁹ So Merk claims, "That the synoptic tradition . . . is not clearly demonstrable in Paul is still the far better secured thesis than the opposite view. Paul did not know the stream that is known to us as the synoptic tradition, even if a few *Herrenworte* appear in Paul."¹⁰ Furnish is surprised at "the fact that the teaching of the earthly Jesus seems not to play as vital, or at least as obvious, a role in Paul's concrete ethical instructions as the OT"¹¹ For him, the fact that in the few instances of citing the *Herrenworte*, Paul does not refer to them as "words of Jesus" but rather as those of "the Lord" is a matter of "the greatest significance," as it shows that "Paul does not appeal to Jesus as an earthly teacher . . . but to the risen, reigning *Christ*, the church's *Lord*."¹² Further, Furnish finds it noteworthy that "none of [the] imitation passages [1 Cor 4:16-17; 11:1; Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:6-7; 2:14] singles out any particular qualities of the earthly Jesus with the insistence that they be emulated. Rather, it seems always to be the humble, giving, and obedient *love* of the crucified and resurrected Lord to which the final appeal is made."¹³ This last point is confirmed also by Merk: "None of the mentioned passages is directly linked to a word of Jesus—or even as of the risen one."¹⁴

However, on this point W. Schrage presents a somewhat different view. He also emphasizes that "Paul has scarcely drawn the historical life and work of Jesus for the concrete orientation of the Christian life. Hence every attempt to copy or imitate the life of Jesus, which regards Jesus as a model, is not Pauline." Yet Schrage immediately adds that the imitation passages show that Christ's self-giving in his incarnation and crucifixion "mediates not only a formal impulse for disposition (*Gesinnungsimpuls*) but sets out from itself a certain fundamental

R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament I* (London: SCM, 1952), 188: "When [Paul] refers to Christ as an example, he is thinking not of the historical but of the pre-existent Jesus." Cf. also M. Dibelius, "Nachfolge Christi," *RGG* (2d ed.) 4:395-96 and E. Lohse, "Nachfolge Christi," *RGG* (3d ed.) 4:1286--87; both cited from Merk, "Nachahmung," 174-75.

9. Bultmann, "Bedeutung," 190-91; *Theology*, 188-89.

10. Merk, "Nachahmung," 205.

11. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 55; cf. also 59.

12. *Ibid.*, 56 (his italics), obviously following R. Bultmann, "Paulus," *RGG* (2d ed.) 4:1028 again! As if Paul distinguished the two! See Kümmel, "Jesus and Paulus," 451, for the view that "Paul sees the earthly Jesus and the exalted Lord as one"; cf. also Schrage, *Ethik*, 201.

13. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 223.

14. Merk, "Nachahmung," 205.

direction for Christian life."¹⁵ Schrage further stresses that the sayings of Jesus were important for Paul:

What is true of the life of Jesus cannot be said of his preaching in the same way. About the significance of the words of Jesus we cannot pass the same negative judgment as about the significance of Jesus as an earthly person or ethical model. . . . Direct references to the *Herrenworte* are indeed rare, and yet it cannot be overlooked how Paul takes up the sayings of Jesus and what importance he attaches to them.¹⁶

Then Schrage goes on to say that "certainly Paul did not understand the sayings isolated from him who spoke them," and rejects the Bultmannian claim that Paul understood the transmitted *Herrenworte* not as sayings of the earthly Jesus but as of the exalted Lord.¹⁷ For Schrage 1 Cor 11:23ff. shows that "Paul was not satisfied with the mere formal 'Dass' of the earthly life of Jesus but held firmly to a certain story of Jesus Christ, indeed to narrative elements and above all to sayings of Jesus."¹⁸ Schrage says, "It is remarkable that all cited *Herrenworte* including 1 Cor 11:23ff. are concerned about the Christian way of life."¹⁹ Then, noting that Paul understands them in terms of the love command,²⁰ Schrage concludes that "to that extent there exists for Paul a far-reaching agreement between the exemplary character of the life and saying of Jesus."²¹

If this is so, how can Schrage so emphatically endorse the Bultmannian denial of Paul's drawing on the historical life and work of Jesus for his teaching on Christian living?²² To me, Schrage's ambivalence only seems to highlight the power of the theological prejudice that has prevailed in certain circles on the question of the relationship between Paul and the historical Jesus. Against this prejudice, we need to investigate the following questions: (1) In his call for *imitatio Christi*, does Paul have in view only the self-giving of Christ in his incarnation and crucifixion or also the example and teaching of the historical Jesus? (2) If the latter be the case, does Paul call his readers to imitate only the love of Jesus Christ or also some other features of his life and teaching?²³

15. Both quotations from Schrage, *Ethik*, 199.

16. *Ibid.*, 200 (his italics).

17. *Ibid.*, 201: "This is an alternative unknown to Paul."

18. *Ibid.*, 201-2.

19. *Ibid.*, 202.

20. Here, following H. Schürmann, "Das Gesetz des Christus," 286.

21. Schrage, *Ethik*, 202.

22. *Ibid.*, 199.

23. Contrast W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther; 2. Teilband: 1 Kor 6,12-11,16* (EKK 7/2; Solothurn: Benziger Verlag / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995) 477: "Die *imitatio Christi* besteht inhaltlich vom Makrokontext der drei Kapitel wie auch

2. OBSERVATIONS ON 1 CORINTHIANS 8:1-11:1

*Not Only Christ's Self-Giving in His Incarnation and Death
but Also a Saying of Jesus*

In 11:1 Paul calls the Corinthians to imitate his example stated in 10:33: καθὼς κἀγὼ πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἑμαυτοῦ σύμφορον ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἵνα σωθῶσιν. His example is in fact the result of his imitation of Christ (11:1b: καθὼς κἀγὼ Χριστοῦ). Therefore, the example stated in 10:33 is ultimately that of Christ. With the sentence, then, is Paul just generally characterizing Jesus' life and death as having been sacrificial for others? For that intent, the verse, with both the words πάντα and πολλῶν in common and the common antithetical sentence structure, and with the same idea basically, is far too clearly reminiscent of the saying of Jesus transmitted in Mark 10:45/Matt 20:281(cf. also 1 Tim 2:5-6).²⁴ Note the close parallelism between the two.

1 Cor 10:33: to please all people (πάντα) . . . , **NOT** seeking my own advantage,
BUT that of many (πολλῶν)

that they [all/many] may be *saved*

Mark 10:45:

NOT to be served

BUT to serve and to give his life [for many/all people—πάντων in
Mark 10:44

as ransom for many (πολλῶν)

As we shall see, there is a close parallelism between 1 Cor 9:19-22 and 10:32-33. This parallelism strengthens our observation of the parallelism between 1 Cor 10:33 and Mark 10:45, since there is also a close parallelism between 1 Cor 9:19 and Mark 14:44-45:

1 Cor 9:19: πᾶσιν ἑμαυτὸν ἐδούλωθα, ἵνα πλείονας κερδήσω, and
Mark 10:44-45: ἔσται πάντων δούλος . . . διακονῆσαι . . . λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν
(NB: the same idea and vocabulary: becoming a slave of all, in order to save many)²⁵

von 8,11 her nicht in der Nachahmung des irdischen Jesus oder gar von Einzelheiten dieses Lebens, sondern wie auch sonst in der durch das Heilsgeschehen begründeten Entesprechung zum Verhalten Jesu Christi, d.h. im Verzicht auf die ἐξουσία und der aus Liebe erwachsenen und auf die Rettung der 'vielen' zielenden Lebenshingabe."

24. So M. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1-15.13* (JSNT 59; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 213; D. Wenham, *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 269-70; cf. also F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1971), 102.

25. So J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck Ruprecht, 1910), 243; Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 86; Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 213; Wenham, *Paul*, 269; Schürmann "Das Gesetz des Christus," 286; R. Riesner, "Paulus und die Jesus-Überlieferung," in *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung Kirche* (P. Stuhlmacher FS; ed. J. Adna,

Thus, contrary to the assertions of Furnish and Merk,²⁶ Paul does echo a saying of the earthly Jesus (Mark 10:44-45) and allude to a quality of his life in the context of speaking of imitating Christ. In connection with our present concern, what then are its implications? First of all, it means that one cannot argue as does Schrage that since in 1 Cor 11:1 Paul is talking about imitating *Christ* rather than *Jesus*, Paul is not thinking of the earthly Jesus as the object of imitation.²⁷ Further, it is hardly possible to think that Paul understands the saying of Mark 10:44-45 as a saying of the risen Lord rather than the earthly Jesus. Even if the unrealistic view is somehow granted that Paul thinks of the risen Lord apart from the historical Jesus, it is impossible to think that in echoing Jesus' saying of his giving his life as ransom for many Paul thinks only of the risen Lord but not of the historical Jesus who actually gave his life to death. Then does Paul have in mind here only Christ's self-giving in his incarnation and death? No doubt, Paul has this chiefly in view. However, there are indications that he has more features of the historical Jesus in view than just the two moments of his life, incarnation and death.

Not Only a Saying of Self-Giving but Also a Saying about Stumbling Block

In 10:32 Paul exhorts the readers, "Give no offense (ἀπρόσκοποι . . . γίνεσθε) to Jews or to Greeks or to the church of God." It is really a negative formulation of the positive statement of v. 33. So in the two verses Paul is saying in effect: "Do not give offense to anybody, but please everybody, just as I am trying to do." Note the context of this advice: Paul gives it at the conclusion of his long and careful treatment of the problem of eating idol food in 1 Cor 8-10. So vv. 32-33 immediately recall the statement he made at the conclusion of the first phase of the treatment (8:13): "Therefore, if food causes my brother to stumble (σκανδαλίζει), I will never eat meat, lest I cause my brother to stumble (σκανδαλίσω)." This example of his is presented to enforce his advice for the knowledge-boasters in the Corinthian church not to exercise their right/freedom in such a way as to present a "stumbling block" (πρόσκομμα) to "the weak" (1 Cor 8:9). So it is clear that Paul is using πρόσκομμα/προσκοπτειν and σκάν-

S. J. Hafemann, and O. Hofius; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 364. We could argue here both ways: 1 Cor 9:19-22//10:32-33-1 Cor 9:19//Mark 10:44-45—therefore, 1 Cor 10:32-33//Mark 10:45, or 1 Cor 10:32-33//Mark 10:45—1 Cor 9:19//Mark 10:44-45—therefore 1 Cor 10:32-33 //9:19-22.

26. See nn. 18-19 above. Contra also H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 212.

27. Schrage, *Ethik*, 199; but cf. n. 17 above.

δαλον/σκανδαλίξειν as synonyms. This is confirmed by Rom 14:13: "rather decide never to put a stumbling block (πρόσκομμα) or hindrance (σκάνδαλον)" (see further Rom 14:20-21). It is well known that σκάνδαλον/σκανδαλίξειν is attested rarely outside the Biblical Greek (LXX and NT), but plays an important role in the Jesus tradition.²⁸ For this reason as well as the close correspondence of the ideas, it is highly likely that in 1 Cor 8:13 and 10:32 as well as in Rom 14:13 Paul is echoing Jesus' stern warning for his disciples not "to cause one of these little ones (οἱ μικροί) among believers to stumble (σκανδαλίξειν)" (Mark 9:42-50/Matt 18:6-9/Luke 17:1-2; cf. also Matt 17:24-27).²⁹ Paul seems to be identifying the "weak" Christians in 1 Cor 8-10 and Rom 14-15 with the οἱ μικροί of Jesus' saying.³⁰

What does it mean then that in the context of talking about imitating Christ Paul echoes Jesus' teaching not to cause "weak" believers to stumble (Mark 9:42-50 pars.) as well as his saying about his self-giving (Mark 10:44-45 par.)? It clearly suggests that Paul has Jesus in mind not only as one who gave oneself to save others, but also as one who *taught* one's followers about responsible and caring behavior. Thus, in talking about imitating Christ, Paul has in view not only Christ's act of self-giving in his incarnation and death, but also his *teaching* about behaving responsibly in the interest of others. That is, Paul means that imitating Christ involves following his teaching as well as his act of self-giving.

Chiefly Jesus' Teaching and Act of Love

In 10:32-33, no doubt, Paul has in mind chiefly Jesus' act and teaching of *love* for others. He means that the Corinthians are to imitate Jesus' act of loving in his self-giving for the salvation of many and are to follow his teaching about loving (not offending) others, just as Paul himself does.

However, note that the example Paul provides in 1 Cor 10:32-33 is a summary restatement of his apostolic example that he cited in 1 Cor 9:19-22.³¹ So, taking the two passages together, we find Paul

28. See G. Stählin, σκάνδαλον κτλ., *TDNT* 7:339-56; Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 175-79.

29. Thompson, *ibid.*, 175-83; Wenham, *Paul*, 264-65; C. H. Dodd, "Ἐννομος Χριστοῦ, in *More New Testament Studies* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968; originally in *Studia Paulina* [J. G. Zwaan FS; Haarlem, 1953]), 145; Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 82; D. C. Allison Jr., "The Pauline Epistles and the Synoptic Gospels: The Pattern of the Parallels," *NTS* 28 (1982): 14-15; Schürmann, "Das Gesetz des Christus," 286; cf. also Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 53.

30. Cf. Wenham, *Paul*, 264.

31. Cf. G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 489-90; Schrage, *1 Korinther (1 Kor 6,12-11,16)*, 475-76; C. Wolff, *Der erste*

saying this: In order not to give offense to Jews or "those under the law" but to please them, he became "as a Jew" or "as one under the law" to the Jews; in order not to give offense to the Greeks or "those outside the law" but to please them, he became as "one outside the law" to "those outside the law"; and in order not to give offense to the church of God or "the weak" members of it but to please them, he became "weak" to "the weak."³² Doing all this is an act of sacrificing his own advantage in order to seek that of many—that is, sacrificing his own freedom and making himself a slave to all. All this he does in order to "win" them, that is, to "save" them. In view of this close correspondence between the two passages, we must also see the correspondence between the concepts "the law of Christ" in 9:21 and the example of Christ in 10:33: in adapting himself to please his Jewish, Greek, or "weak" Christian audience, Paul follows the example of Christ or observes "the law of Christ."

With "the law of Christ" in 9:19-22 Paul clearly has in mind chiefly Jesus' teaching on love. We have already observed that in that passage and in its parallel passage, 10:32-33, Paul echoes Jesus' ransom saying (Mark 10:45 par.) and scandal saying (Mark 9:42-50 pars.), which both have love for others as their main point. In Gal 6:2, with the concept of "the law of Christ," Paul also has Jesus' love command (Mark 12:28-31 pars.) in view. For there Paul's exhortation "bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ" is to be taken together with his earlier statement in Gal 5:14: "For the whole law is

Brief des Paulus an die Korinther, vol. 2: *Auslegung der Kapitel 8-16* (THKNT 7/2; Berlin: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 1982), 63; Horrell, "Theological Principle," 106. NB the function of 1 Cor 9 within 1 Cor 8-10: in ch. 9 Paul demonstrates his own example of renouncing his right/freedom for the sake of the gospel/the church/others in order to reinforce his teaching in chs. 8 and 10.

32. In view of the correspondence between 9:19-22 and 10:32-33, it appears that "the weak" in the former is to be identified with "the church of God" in the latter, and that in the latter we are to understand Paul as exhorting mainly the knowledge-boasters not to give offense to the "weak" members of the church (cf. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 489). By omitting ὡς before "weak" in 9:22, Paul seems to be intending to avoid an impression of too clear an identification on his part with the knowledge-boasters in Corinth. For if he wrote ὡς before "weak" in 9:22 as before ἰουδαῖος, ὑπὸ νόμον and ἄνομος in the preceding verses, he would be clearly expressing that he in fact belongs to the camp opposite to the "weak" (i.e., the group of the knowledge-boasters), though condescending to become "as weak." Being conscious of the touchiness of the "weak" brethren in Corinth, he apparently tries to identify with them, instead, as much as possible. He can "become weak to the weak" only because normally he is not "weak." He does not balance this phrase with a phrase such as "I became (as) strong to the strong," because, having already implied it in the phrase τοῖς ἀνόμοις ὡς ἄνομος to some extent, he does not want to stress his identification with the "strong" but rather wants to urge them to imitate him in accommodating to the needs of others. Cf. Horrell, "Theological Principle," 94.

fulfilled in one word, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself' (cf. Rom 13:8-10).³³ This makes it quite likely that in 1 Cor 9:19-22 Paul's concept of "the law of Christ" also has in mind Jesus' love command itself, as well as his love teaching contained in the ransom and scandal sayings.³⁴

First Corinthians 10:23-11:1 is clearly the concluding section in which Paul recapitulates his arguments in 1 Cor 8-10. It is true that the points recapitulated here are mainly the ones that he made in chs. 8-9.³⁵ This fact orients us to understand both that his dominant concern in 1 Cor 8-10 is the knowledge-boasters' need to give up their right / freedom to eat *eidōlothuta* out of respect for the interest of the weak brothers and sisters and that 1 Cor 10:1-22 represents an additional argument for abstaining from *eidōlothuta*.³⁶

However, Horrell goes too far when he says, "Notable in this concluding section is the lack of any reference back to 10.1-22. All the reiterations and repetitions relate to chs. 8 and 9."³⁷ Actually 10:31 does appear to recapitulate the concern of 10:1-22. Idol worship is so diametrically opposed to rendering glory to God that it is difficult to imagine that having just argued at length against idolatry (10:1-22), which would "provoke the Lord to jealousy" (10:22), Paul would not have associated that thought with his talk of the duty to glorify God in 10:31. Thus, in the verse, we should understand that Paul is exhorting the Corinthians to glorify God by abstaining from eating *eidōlothuta* in an idolatrous situation as well as by properly respecting the concerns of the weak brothers and sisters in dining. Then, in 10:31, we may hear an echo of the first element of Jesus' double commandment of love: Love your God with your whole being (Mark 12:30 pars.; cf. 1 Cor 8:6), as we hear an echo of its second element (neighbor love; Mark 12:31 pars.) in this same context (10:28, 32-33; cf. 9:19-22).

This interpretation is strongly supported by the observation of a double, chiasmically-constructed *inclusio* that the concluding summary

33. See Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 121-40, for an extensive demonstration that in Rom 13:8-10 as well as in Gal 6:2 Paul alludes to Jesus' commandment of love (Mark 12:28-31 pars.) also S. Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 266-68, with an additional observation that Rom 12:1-2 could echo the first element of Jesus' double commandment of love as Rom 13:8-10 does the second.

34. Cf. Schürmann, "Das Gesetz des Christus," 290-94.

35. Horrell, "The logical Principle," 102, quoting J. C. Hurd, *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (London: SPCK, 1965), 128: "Closer comparison reveals that the whole of 1 Cor 10.23-11.1 is a point by point restatement and summary of the argument of 1 Cor. 8 and 9." Cf. also Schrage, *1 Korinther (1 Kor 6,12-11,16)*, 461.

36. Cf. Horrell, "Theological Principle," 100-102.

37. *Ibid.*, 104; similarly also Schrage, *1 Korinther (1 Kor 6,12-11,16)*, 461.

of 10:31-33 builds with the thesis statement that Paul makes in the opening section of 8:1-3. Note the correspondence between the emphasis on love that builds up (οἰκοδομεῖ; 8:1) and the demand on self-sacrificing love that does not cause anyone to stumble (ἀπόσκοποι) in 10:32-33, and between loving God in 8:3 and glorifying God in 10:31. Having stated his thesis in the opening section of 8:1-3 that with regard to the problem of *eidōlothuta* what really matters is not "knowledge" but rather love—of God and of neighbors, Paul concludes his long discussion in 10:31-33 with a call to love (that is, glorify) God and love neighbors.

Thus, in 10:31 and 32-33 both elements of Jesus' double commandment of love seem to be reflected side by side.³⁸ Therefore, we may infer that with the concept of "the law of Christ" in 9:19-22, the parallel passage of 10:31-33, Paul has in view both elements of Jesus' double commandment of love.

Jesus' Teaching on Food/Purity Also

However, more than the love teaching of Jesus seems to be involved in the concept of "the law of Christ." This is suggested by Paul's contrasting this concept with the law of Moses in 9:19-22. Paul says that he is no longer "under the law (of Moses)" but "in the law of Christ." in what way is "the law of Christ" different from the law of Moses?³⁹ The love command alone would not lead to a contrast between the two laws, because the law of Moses also centers on the love command—that is, love of God and love of neighbor. In saying that he

38. So 10:23-11:1 is to be understood as a summary of the whole of chs. 8-10, with emphasis on the dominant concern of chs. 8-9. The structure of the concluding summary could be tabulated thus:

- 10:23-30 summary of chs. 8-9: Christian freedom with *adiaphora*; but the duty to sacrifice it for neighbor love
- 10:31 summary of 10:1-22: no idolatry (esp. 10:14), for the sake of love for God—*inclusio* with 8:3
- 10:32-33 reiteration of the summary of chs. 8-9 (recalling particularly 9:19-22): the duty to sacrifice one's interest for the sake of others—*inclusio* with 8:1
- 11:1 summary of 10:32-33 and grand summary of the whole: love for God; love for neighbor; Christian freedom

N.B. the neat chiasmic structure of the double *inclusio*:

A: 8:1

B: 8:2

B': 10:31

A': 10:32-33

39. See below, pp. 210-14, contra P. J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (CRINT; Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum / Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 278-80, who refuses to see any difference between them.

adapts himself to the Greeks ("those outside the law") "as one outside the law (of Moses)" but as one "in the law of Christ," Paul implies that the law of Christ sanctions such an adaptation whereas the law of Moses does not. Now, considering the context of this statement of Paul, namely, a discussion of eating *eidōlothuta*, we seem bound to conclude that Paul has in mind here the question of food/purity rules beyond the love of neighbor. If he wants to keep the law of Moses with its many food/purity rules as he did during his Pharisaic days, he would not accommodate himself to the Gentiles as he does now. But he is no longer bound to the law of Moses and he does not find "the law of Christ" equally prohibitive about his accommodation to the Gentiles with regard to questions of food/purity.

What, then, about "the law of Christ" allows Paul to ignore the food/purity rules of the law of Moses? The principle of love of neighbor (i.e., love for the Gentiles, to please them and save them) alone would not lead Paul to be ἄνομος to the Gentiles—that is, to ignore the food/purity rule for the sake of the Gentiles—because if he maintains his Pharisaic understanding of purity he would think that for the sake of the higher principle—namely love for God—he must keep God's purity regulations enshrined in the law of Moses. This line of reasoning suggests that Paul not only sees "the law of Christ" as emphasizing the love command but also dispensing with the food/purity rules of the law of Moses. With "the law of Christ" Paul refers to Jesus' setting aside the food/purity rules as well as his stressing the love command. Only so could Paul, guided by "the law of Christ," accommodate himself to the Gentiles "as one outside the law," that is, ignoring the food/purity regulations of the law of Moses.⁴⁰ This conclusion points to Jesus' ruling about food/purity in Mark 7:15/ Matt 15:11, the *marshal* saying of Jesus whose intent Mark correctly interprets: "Thus he declared all foods clean" (Mark 7:19).⁴¹

40. So Schürmann's interpretation of "the law of Christ" as exclusively concentrating on Jesus Christ's exemplary act of self-giving and on his words about love ("Das Gesetz des Christus," 283-94) needs to be modified. It is true that the theme of love dominates in many of Paul's references/allusions to the *Herrenworte* (see the list in Schürmann, 286). But Schürmann himself recognizes many exceptions including Mark 7:15/Rom 14:14, 20 (i id.). Impressed by the language Paul uses in reference to sayings of Jesus (διατάσσειν, 1 Cor 9:14, and ἐπιταγή, 1 Cor 7:25), as well as the way Paul uses sayings of Jesus (Rom 14:10, 13, 14, 20; Gal 6:1-5; 1 Cor 5:4-5), Dodd, "Ἐννομος Χριστοῦ, 141-47, suggests that Paul conceives of "the law of Christ" in terms of the precepts of Jesus Christ contained in sayings of Jesus such as those to which he refers in those passages. If Schürmann needs to expand his understanding of "the law of Christ" to include some other elements such as Jesus' ruling on food/purity, Dodd seems to need to see Jesus' example and teaching of love as being the focus of "the law of Christ."

41. Cf. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 490 n. 70.

It is widely recognized that in Rom 14:14 and 20 Paul alludes to this ruling of Jesus.⁴² Apparently dealing with a dispute in the Roman church between the "strong" who eat anything and the "weak" who eat only vegetables (Rom 14:2, 21), Paul imparts very similar advice to the Romans as to the Corinthians. Just as in 1 Cor 10:32 (cf. also 8:13), so also in Rom 14:13, he exhorts the Romans "not to put a stumbling block (πρόσκομμα) or hindrance (σκάνδαλον) to a brother!" Just as he advises the knowledge-boasters in Corinth to sacrifice their right/freedom of eating *eidōlothuta* in order not to ruin the "weak" brothers or to cause them to stumble in 1 Cor 8:7-13; 9:19-22; 10:25-33, so also in Rom 14:13-23 he advises the "strong" in Rome to sacrifice their right/freedom of eating anything in order not to ruin the "weak" brethren or to cause them to stumble. Thus, just as he grants that the knowledge-boasters in Corinth have their "right" (ἐξουσία—1 Cor 8:9; cf. 10:23) or "freedom" (ἐλευθερία—cf. 1 Cor 9:1, 19) to eat *eidōlothuta*, so also in Rom 14 he assumes that the "strong" in Rome have their right/freedom to eat anything. It is only out of love for brothers and sisters for whom Christ died that they are to sacrifice it (Rom 14:15; 1 Cor 8:11). In Rom 14 Paul provides the basis for this assumption: "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself. . . . All things are clean" (vv. 14, 20).

John Barclay appreciates the great significance of this declaration: "This constitutes nothing less than a fundamental rejection of the Jewish law in one of its most sensitive dimensions."⁴³ He draws attention also to the striking manner of Paul's rejection: "It is important to observe that Paul does not base his judgment here on an appeal to a 'higher principle' in the law or on an allegorical interpretation of the law"⁴⁴ So, for Barclay, "The certainty and candour with which Paul here expresses his freedom from the law is thus quite breathtaking."⁴⁵ Barclay is to be complimented for his acute observation of both the revolutionary content of the statement of Rom 14:14, 20 and the striking manner in which it is made. When we consider the fact that the

42. So, even the minimalists: Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 53; and N. Walter, "Paul and the Early Christian Jewish-Tradition," in *Paul and Jesus* (ed. A. J. M. Wedderburn and C. Wolff; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 71-72 (in spite of what he says on p. 57).

43. John M. G. Barclay, "'Do We Undermine the Law?' A Study of Romans 14.1-15.6," in *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (WUNT 89; ed. J. D. G. Dunn; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 300.

44. *Ibid.*, 300.

45. *Ibid.*, 301; cf. also Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 196, who appreciates the astonishing nature of the simple declaration all the more in view of the recipients of Romans, who must have included some Jewish Christians and of the intention that Paul has in the epistle for wooing the united support of Roman Christians for his mission to Spain.

statement is made by a former Pharisee who used to be zealous for the law (Gal 1:13-14, Phil 3:5-6), especially for the regulations about food and purity (cf. Mark 7:1-5 par.!), they are even more astonishing. So we are bound to ask with C. H. Dodd, "On what grounds, then, does [Paul] affirm this maxim?"⁴⁶ According to Barclay, while the saying of Jesus in Mark 7:15-19 could possibly lie behind it, "Paul makes no attempt here to present Jesus as an interpreter of the law."⁴⁷ According to Dodd, however, Paul's sentence in Rom 14:14, "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus," does indicate that he bases his declaration on the teaching of the historical Jesus, such as Mark 7:15-23.⁴⁸ Surely Paul's appeal here to "the Lord Jesus" while making an astonishing statement that closely corresponds to the saying of Jesus supports Dodd's interpretation.⁴⁹

46. Dodd, "Ἐννομος Χριστοῦ", 144.

47. Barclay, "Do We Undermine the Law?", 300-301.

48. Dodd, "Ἐννομος Χριστοῦ", 144; for a fuller argument, see Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 194-99. The latter (pp. 188-94) also provides a strong defense for the authenticity of the logion Mark 7:15/Matt 15:11. The high probability of its allusion or echo in Rom 14-15 and 1 Cor 8-10 in turn strengthens its authenticity.

49. Contra H. Räisänen, "Zur Herkunft von Markus 7, 15," in *The Torah and Christ* (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1986), 209-18, who rather arbitrarily denies an allusion to Mark 7:15 in Rom 14:14 in spite of the agreement in words (οὐδέν and κοινόν) and ideas between the two passages and of the close agreement between Mark 7:19 and Rom 14:20 (pp. 214-15) and argues that the saying in Mark 7:15 is inauthentic because, he alleges, it has no *Wirkungsgeschichte*. In a follow-up essay, "Jesus and the Food Laws: Reflections on Mark 7.15," in the same volume (pp. 215-41), he strengthens his denial of the authenticity of the logion by asserting that Paul does not use it in his dealing with the food questions in 1 Cor 8-10 and Rom 14-15 (p. 235). Here I am arguing that Paul's discussions in 1 Cor 8-10 as well as Rom 14-15 are part of the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the logion, with Rom 14:14 being a clear allusion to it, and that as such they strengthen the case for its authenticity, which is supported by "a broad consensus among NT scholars" as Räisänen himself says (p. 219). In reporting the Antiochian controversy in Gal 2:11-14, Paul may be refraining from referring to the logion because he was conscious of a different interpretation of it by the Jerusalemites, as well as of the fact that he could hardly speak as authoritatively as Peter on the Jesus tradition. When Räisänen (pp. 214-15) disputes the view that the sentence οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ is an indicator of Paul's referring to the logion of Jesus, he fails to consider not only the cumulative effect that the sentence builds together with the verbal and ideological agreements between Rom 14:14 and Mark 7:15, but also to appreciate that sentence in the light of the phrases, "the law of Christ" (1 Cor 9:21) and imitation of Christ (1 Cor 11:1). If we take the sentence of Rom 14:14a together with the latter two phrases—as we should because they appear in the similar contexts of dealing with questions about food and imparting similar lessons that are, as we argue presently, strongly reminiscent of Mark 7:15—the sentence appears more clearly as a reference to Jesus' teaching. Cf. also Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 188-96; R. H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 370-71, against Räisänen.

Now what is the significance of Paul's alluding to the saying of Jesus in Mark 7:15 when giving basically the same advice for essentially the same problem regarding food in both Romans and 1 Corinthians? Besides the similarities between the presenting problems and in Paul's treatment of them in the two epistles, we must also bear in mind that Romans was written from Corinth only a couple of years after 1 Corinthians itself. These facts seem to suggest that in 1 Cor 8-10 Paul is also guided by the saying of Jesus in Mark 7:15 as he is in Rom 14-15. We have already noted that 1 Cor 9:19-22 and 10:32-33 themselves, on close observation, point to Paul's having in mind a teaching of Jesus like Mark 7:15. So it appears reasonable to conclude that, after implying in 1 Cor 8-10 that he is following Jesus' teaching in Mark 7:15, Paul makes it explicit in Rom 14-15.

No doubt, only because he had a conviction such as that expressed in Mark 7:15-23 could Jesus eat and drink with tax collectors and sinners against the opposition of the Pharisees and scribes (Mark 2:15-17 pars.; Matt 11:19/Luke 7:34; Luke 15:1-2; 19:1-10; cf. Matt 21:31-2; Luke 7:29). Frequently describing the kingdom of God with the metaphor of a feast (Matt 8:11/Luke 7:19; Matt 22:1-10/Luke 14:16-24; Luke 15:11-32; etc.), he demonstrated its proleptic realization in his mission by holding feasts with those sinners who accepted his invitation into it. Had Paul known Jesus' ruling on food/purity in Mark 7:15, he must have also known this characteristic, notorious conduct of Jesus, which was a demonstration of that ruling.

Imitate Also Christ's Freedom on Food/Purity Questions

If so, we have to conclude also that in dealing with the problem of *eidōlothuta* in 1 Cor 8-10 Paul is guided not only by Jesus' double commandment of love but also by his teaching on food/purity, and that with the notion of imitating Christ Paul has in mind not only Christ's self-sacrificing love for others but also Jesus' freedom from the food/purity regulations. We are to imitate Christ by following *both* his teaching (Mark 10:45 par.; 9:42-50 pars.; 12:28-34 pars.) and example (his death) of self-giving *and* his teaching (Mark 7:15 par.) and example (banqueting with sinners) of freedom from the food/purity laws.⁵⁰

As a result of following Jesus' teaching on food and purity and imitating Jesus' example of eating and drinking with sinners,⁵¹ Paul

50. Since the allusions to or echoes of Jesus' sayings in Mark 7:15 par.; 9:42-50 pars.; 10:45 par.; and 12:28-34 pars. are accompanied by Paul's references to the "law of Christ" and the example of Christ in 9:19-23 and 10:23-11:1, these references may be regarded as "tradition indicators" (i.e., indicators of referring to the Jesus tradition).

51. Cf. P. Richardson and P. W. Gooch, 'Accommodation Ethics,' *TynBul* 29 (1978). In the section "B. Early Christian Sources of an Accommodation Ethic—from Jesus to

is able to advise the Corinthian Christians to "eat whatever is sold in the market, without inquiring on the ground of conscience" (1 Cor 10:25) and to accept pagan neighbor's invitation and "eat whatever is set before you, without inquiring on the ground of conscience" (1 Cor 10:27). Some, of not the majority, of the food sold in the Corinthian market is likely to be *eidōlothuta*,⁵² and likewise at least some of the food set on the table of a pagan neighbor is likely to be *eidōlothuta*. So this advice presupposes the views that all food, even *eidōlothuta*, is clean (cf. Rom 14:14, 20) and that Christians may associate themselves freely with unbelievers without fear of defilement (cf. 1 Cor 7:12-14). Because he holds these views, Paul is able to grant that the knowledge-boasters in Corinth have the right to eat (of course, *eidōlothuta*) even "in an idol's temple," that is, probably in private parties held in a pagan temple, although he has to object to their exercising the right, on the ground that it would cause "weak" brethren to stumble (1 Cor 8:10). For this astonishingly "liberal" teaching⁵³ Paul indirectly appeals to "the law of Christ," which differs from the law of Moses on the question of food/purity (1 Cor 9:20), and ultimately to the example of Christ (1 Cor 11:1).⁵⁴

Paul" (pp. 118-42), Richardson argues that what he calls Paul's "accommodation ethic" in 1 Cor 9:19-22 and 10:31-11:1 is ultimately a development of Jesus' example of accommodating to the needs of various people, including sinners and tax collectors.

52. Cf. B. W. Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 287-301, about the availability of kosher food in Corinth. Winter (pp. 297-301) speculates that after Paul's first mission to Corinth the city officials withdrew special provisions on kosher meat, creating difficulties for the Corinthian church, and that this situation forms the background for Paul's advice in 1 Cor 10:25-29.

53. The spirit of Paul's teachings in 1 Cor 8:10; 10:25 and 27 is incomparably more liberal than the most liberal interpretation that E. P. Sanders seeks to put on the attitudes of first-century Jews toward associating with Gentiles ("Jewish Association with Gentiles and Galatians 2:11-14," in *Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John--J. Louis Martyn FS* [ed. R. T. Fortna and B. R. Gaventa; Nashville: Abingdon, 1990], 170-88). P. Borgen, "'Yes,' 'No,' 'How Far?': The Participation of Jews and Christians in Pagan Cults," in *Paul and His Hellenistic Context* (ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 30-59, illustrates the liberal attitudes of some loose and even apostate Jews toward associating with Gentiles or participating in pagan cults, as well as the strict prohibition of such practices among the more religiously committed Jews. Concluding that "there were Jews and Christians who followed a practice similar to that of Paul, and some who went even further than he did" (pp. 56-57), Pedersen tries to explain Paul's liberal attitude in 1 Cor 8 and 10 from within this diversity of the Jewish attitudes (cf. P. Tomson's work discussed in the next section). But such an attempt is not very helpful insofar as it cannot explain how such a strict, indeed "zealotic" Pharisee as Paul (Gal 1:13-14; Phil 3:4-6) could come to have such a liberal attitude. See A. F. Segal, *Paul the Convert* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 231-33, about the Pharisees' "punctilious observance of food laws" (p. 231) in contrast to the looser attitudes of some other Jews.

54. Some may object to my view that in 1 Cor 8-10 one of the bases of Paul's advice is Jesus' teaching in Mark 7:15-20, by pointing out that in 1 Cor 10:26 Paul justifies

The Priority of Love

However, what Paul stresses even more in 1 Cor 8-10 than the Christian freedom based on Jesus' teaching and example is the Christian duty of love. This duty is apparently called for by the knowledge-boasters' more aggressive claim to their right/freedom and the defensive position of the "weak" believers in Corinth (cf. 1 Cor 8:1-3, 7-13). The knowledge-boasters must sacrifice their right/freedom to eat *eidōlothuta* in a pagan temple in order not to cause the "weak" brethren to stumble (1 Cor 8:9-12). Having supported this advice with his own exemplary determination (1 Cor 8:13), Paul goes on to demonstrate his example of foregoing various apostolic rights, including gaining his livelihood by the gospel, as well as his example of sacrificing his freedom for the needs of his audience in order to serve the Jews, the Gentiles, and the "weak" Christians and in so doing win them to faith and salvation (1 Cor 9:1-27). In the concluding section, while affirming Christian freedom on the question of food, he immediately calls the Corinthians to sacrifice their freedom when its exercise is likely to cause a neighbor to stumble (1 Cor 10:23-30). Then he wraps up his long and careful treatment of the question of eating *eidōlothuta* by stressing the need to sacrifice our own advantage for the sake of others, citing his own example, which follows the example of Christ (10:32-11:1). As we have seen above, by echoing Jesus' sayings such as Mark 9:42-50 pars. and 10:45 par. in these verses, Paul clearly indicates that his teaching on the priority of love over freedom is based on Jesus' teaching and example of self-giving.

In short, we may say that *the two principles* that guide Paul in his treatment of the question of eating *eidōlothuta* in 1 Cor 8-10 are *the absolute demand of love for God and for others* and *the Christian freedom*

eating market food without questioning by citing Ps 24:1 rather than referring to a saying of Jesus (Mark 7:15-20) as in Rom 14:14, 20. I have already argued (1) that on close observation 1 Cor 9:19-22 and 10:32-11:1 themselves strongly point to that saying of Jesus; (2) that in view of the parallelism between 1 Cor 8-10 and Rom 14-15, the fact that the saying is alluded to in Rom 14:14 and 20 makes it highly likely that in 1 Cor 8-10 also Paul has that saying in mind; and (3) that the fact that Romans was written in Corinth only a couple of years after 1 Corinthians also strengthens this view. Those who would deny the implicit presence of the saying in 1 Cor 8-10 will either have to deny its allusion in Rom 14:14 and 20 or say that Paul learned of the saying during A.D. 54-56 after writing 1 Corinthians and before writing Romans. But neither of these seems plausible. For Paul Ps 24:1 is God's word. In 1 Corinthians, as he is referring to the "law of Christ" (9:20) and the example of Christ (11:1), understanding them as implying the saying of Jesus, he decides to strengthen his advice with an additional authority, namely the word of God, Ps 24:1 (cf. 1 Cor 9:8-14 for Paul's combination of the OT and Jesus' saying for the authoritative grounding of the apostolic right to receive a living by the gospel).

regarding food/purity.⁵⁵ Clearly Paul has learned them from *Jesus, who made the commandment of love for God and for neighbor absolute* (Mark 12:28-35 pars.) *whole making the regulations about food/purity adiaphora* (Mark 7:15-23 pars.). Paul's teaching about *eidōlothuta* in 1 Cor 8-10 in "imitation" of Jesus' teaching and example may be summarized as follows:

**Paul's Teaching about Idol Food (1 Corinthians 8-10):
How Paul "Imitates" Jesus Christ**

1. *The Thesis: The two fundamental principles (8:1-3)*
 - a. Love of neighbor (8:1)—*inclusio* with 10:32-33 (6b)
 - b. Love of God (8:3)—*inclusio* with 10:31 (6a)
2. *Four imperatives (cf. the summary in 10:14, 23-33)*
 - a. Shun idolatry: no participation in the table fellowship at a pagan temple (10:-22, esp. vv. 14-22)
 - b. Eat the meat sold at market without questioning on account of conscience
 - c. When invited by a pagan neighbor, eat the food offered, without questioning
 - d. But do not eat when your eating may offend the "weak" brothers (or the pagan friend's moral expectations of a Christian?)
3. *Three principles*
 - a. No idolatry (2a above)
 - b. Christian freedom (2b + 2c above)
 - c. Love of neighbor (2d above)
4. *Correspondence to Jesus' Teaching*
 - a. Jesus' ignoring the Jewish food/purity laws (Mark 7:15, 19 par.; Rom 14:14, 20) (= 2b + 2c; 3b)
 - b. Jesus' double commandment of love (Mark 12:28-34 pars.)
 - (1) Love of God with one's whole being—*contra* idolatry (= 2a; 3a)
 - (2) Love of neighbor as oneself (= 2d; 3c)
5. *Paul applies these to his own apostolic stance (Paul "imitates" Jesus or observes "the law of Christ" —9:19-22)*
 - a. Adjustment of his missionary stance on the matters of *adiaphora* according to his audience
 - (1) among the Jews/the weak, Paul observes the food/purity laws (= 4b2—love of neighbor)
 - (2) among the Gentiles/the strong, Paul ignores the food/purity laws (= 4a + 4b2—Christian freedom and love of neighbor)
 - b. Yet subject to the "law of God" /"the law of Christ" (= 4a+4b)

55. Three principles, if we analyze the double commandment of love into two separate principles. The concern for the unity and edification of the church may be considered as a further principle. It goes without saying that monotheism (1 Cor 8:4-6) is a fundamental assumption here. Cf. n. 72 below.

6. *Summary statement and call (the double commandment of love)*⁵⁶
- a. Do all things for the glory of God (10:31) (= 4b1)—*inclusio* with 8:3 (1b)
 - b. and out of love of neighbor (10:32-33) (= 4b2)--*inclusio* with 8:1 (1a)
7. *Final summary and call: "Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ" (11:1)*

3. NO CHRISTIAN FREEDOM BUT ONLY AN ABSOLUTE PROHIBITION OF *Eidōlothuta*?

This interpretation of Paul's argument in 1 Cor 8-10 results in confirming the main lines of the traditional majority view that *eidōlothuta* means food offered to an idol, that for Paul eating *eidōlothuta*, whether in temple precincts or at a private home, was not in itself an idolatrous act to be prohibited (8:10; 10:25, 27), and that it is to be shunned, nevertheless, if it causes the "weak" brothers to stumble (8:10; 10:28) or if it takes on the character of idolatry, with participation in the table fellowship on an occasion when sacrifice is actually being offered to an idol (10:14-22).

Some scholars think that this interpretation makes Paul contradict himself first by allowing eating *eidōlothuta* at a temple in principle (8:10) and then by categorically forbidding it as an act of idolatry (10:1-22). So some of these scholars deny that in ch. 8 Paul allows the knowledge-boasters the right to eat *eidōlothuta* at a temple in principle. According to Gordon Fee, Paul prohibits eating *eidōlothuta* at a temple completely both in ch. 8 and 10:1-22, although he allows it at private homes (10:23-11:1). The only difference between ch. 8 and 10:1-22 is that in ch. 8 Paul argues against eating *eidōlothuta* at a temple on ethical grounds, while in 10:1-22 he does the same on theological grounds.⁵⁷ Ben Witherington refines this view by distinguishing εἰδωλόθυτον from ἱερόθυτον. According to him, εἰδωλόθυτον refers to meat eaten at a pagan temple where a god is thought to be present,⁵⁸ whereas ἱερόθυτον refers to food that has come from a temple but is eaten at home.⁵⁹ Then he argues that Paul forbids

56. The reason why in this summary and call Paul stresses only the requirements of love for God and for neighbor is because his main concern is to persuade the knowledge-boasters to be ready to give up their right/freedom for the sake of neighbors as well as to warn them not to fall into idolatry. However, one who has reached this point after carefully listening to Paul's argument up to this point would see the principle of Christian freedom implicitly present in 10:32-33 as Paul phrases the requirement of neighbor love in terms of not laying any stumbling block in front of others.

57. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 359-63.

58. B. F. Witherington, "Not So Idle Thought about *EIDOLOTHUTON*," *TynBul* 44 (1993): 242.

59. *Ibid.*, 248.

εἰδωλόθυτον but permits ἱερόθυτον.⁶⁰ But David Horrell questions the validity of Witherington's linguistic analysis and rightly argues against this line of interpretation: "It is difficult to see why Paul should apparently leave unquestioned the ἐξουσία of the strong to eat εἰδωλόθυτα, even in temple, in ch. 8, if he intended to prohibit that very activity in ch. 10."⁶¹ Indeed, if Paul were objecting to eating εἰδωλόθυτα in a temple as an act of idolatry, he would start his argument against it on that ground first and warn against it as seriously as in 10:1-22 or denounce it as categorically as in Rom 1:18-32. Surely in ch. 8 he would not leave the impression that he was concerned only about its offense to the weak brothers but not at all about its idolatrous character. Furthermore, if in ch. 8 he is not presupposing in principle the right/freedom of the knowledge-boasters to eat *eidōlothuta* in an idol temple and exhorting them to sacrifice it for the sake of the weak brothers, what is the point of his demonstration in ch. 9 of his example of sacrificing his right/freedom as an apostle for the sake of others?

Therefore, with Bruce N. Fisk and David Horrell, I reaffirm the majority view, seeing the difference between 8:10 and 10:14-22 in these terms: in the latter, Paul envisages eating *eidōlothuta*, where it is accompanied with an actual sacrifice to an idol, whereas in the former he envisages a social meal in a temple where it does not entail such a sacrifice.⁶²

However, the most drastic challenge to the majority view has come from Peter J. Tomson and Alex T. Cheung.⁶³ They both insist that Paul absolutely prohibits eating food known as εἰδωλόθυτον under any circumstances. Tomson summarizes his interpretation of Paul's teaching in 1 Cor 8-10 thus: "While 1 Cor 8 introduces the problem and 10:1-22 reiterates the general prohibition of food known to be consecrated to idols, 10:25-29 deals with food of unspecified nature in a

60. Ibid.

61. Horrell, "Theological Principle," 99. See B. N. Fisk, "Eating Meat Offered to Idols: Corinthian Behavior and Pauline Response in 1 Corinthians 8-10 (A Response to Gordon Fee)," *Trinity Journal* 10 (1989): 56-61, for more detailed linguistic and exegetical arguments against Fee and Witherington. P. J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 196, tries to downplay 8:10 as mere rhetorical; and A. T. Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth: Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy* (JSNT 176; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1999), 105-6, endorses Tomson. These days in some circles an appeal to rhetoric has become a convenient knife for cutting away any statement inconvenient to one's theory. Thus Tomson and Cheung seem to betray here only their embarrassment at one of the stumbling blocks for their interpretations. See n. 66 below.

62. For more detailed arguments for this conclusion, see Fisk, "Eating Meat Offered to Idols," 61-64; Horrell, "Theological Principle," 100-101.

63. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*; Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth*; similarly also G. W. Dawes, "The Dang of Idolatry: First Corinthians 8:7-13," *CBQ* 58 (1996): 82-98.

pagan setting" (p. 208). According to Tomson, συνείδησις in 1 Cor 8-10 means "intention" (p. 214), and in the situations where the nature of the food is not specified, Paul tells the Corinthians, they "can eat anything . . . without inquiring because of the intention" (10:25, 27; p. 217). Here Tomson thinks Paul is following the moderate Hillelite halakic tradition that allows dealing with things whose idolatrous intention is not explicitly known (pp. 208-20, also 266).

Tomson's interpretation of the crucial text of 9:19-22 is very revealing. Against the overwhelming manuscript evidence, he, first of all, seeks to eliminate the ὡς before ἵουδαίος as well as the phrase μὴ ὧν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον in v. 20 (pp. 276-79). Then he renders vv. 20a and 22a most strangely and yet revealingly thus: "I was born the Jews a Jew, . . . I was born the delicate [the weak] a delicate [a weak]" (p. 277). Tomson is clearly aware that the phrase μὴ ὧν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον is only making explicit what is already implicit in the preceding τοῖς ὑπὸ νόμον ὡς ὑπο νόμον, because he says that the former phrase is "tautological after the restrictive 'as under the Law'" (p. 278). He uses this as an argument for his view that the former phrase was added by a later scribe (p. 278). Of course, he makes all this effort to delete the phrase μὴ ὧν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον for the sake of his overall thesis that even the Christian Paul was always under the law of Moses and never outside of it. However, what Tomson himself observes defeats his own purpose: The τοῖς ὑπὸ νόμον ὡς ὑπο νόμον, even without μὴ ὧν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον, already implies that Paul could be τοῖς ἀνόμοις ὡς ἄνομος, as Paul in fact says in v. 21a. Likewise, Tomson's effort to delete the ὡς before ἵουδαίος, is also quite futile. For, being parallel to τοῖς ἵουδαίοις [ὡς] ἵουδαίος, τοῖς ὑπὸ νόμον ὡς ὑπο νόμον requires us to understand even the supposedly original τοῖς ἵουδαίοις ἵουδαίος also in the sense of τοῖς ἵουδαίοις ὡς ἵουδαίος.⁶⁴ In fact, Tomson recognizes that the phrase "as under the Law" does suggest "that [Paul] is not really or not in all respects 'under the Law,'" and he even cites passages such as Rom 6:14; Gal 3:23-25 and 5:18 where Paul insists that Christians are not "under the law" (p. 278). But he tries to explain these away by appealing in a rather opaque manner to "Paul's apocalyptic Law theology" (p. 278). Tomson goes on to say:

But it is not clear why this apocalyptic imagery should actually be relevant in our passage, any more than in the sense of a faint echo from some such other context. On the contrary, the reference here is to various "real" human positions or classes. . . . If Paul was a "Jew," he would by all standards of antiquity be "under" the Jewish Law.

64. That is, unless we are to turn it into an incomprehensible sentence as Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 277, does: "I was born the Jews a Jew, . . . I was born the delicate [the weak] a delicate [a weak]."

Indeed, the expression "under the Law" also has a "realistic" connotation which seems rather more appropriate here. . . . In that "realistic" sense it is difficult to imagine how Paul, besides saying he is "not without the Law but respecting it", could also state that he himself is "not under the Law." (pp. 278-79)

It is amazing to see the extent to which Tomson's presupposition of Paul as a law-observant Jew pushes him to go in distorting the Pauline statements about the law. Apparently the fixation also misleads Tomson to see Gal 4:4-5 ("a full and important parallel" to our passage of 1 Cor 9:20, according to him) as pointing against the authenticity of the phrase $\mu\eta\ \omega\upsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\omicron\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\nu$ in 1 Cor 9:20 (p. 279). On the contrary, Gal 4:4-5 declares that God's sending his Son Jesus Christ has ushered in the new aeon in which "those who are under the law" are *redeemed* from the law, the $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, so that they may no longer be under that disciplinarian ($\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota\ \upsilon\pi\omicron\ \pi\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\omicron\nu$, Gal 3:24-25)!

In a quite revealing way, Tomson silently passes over the crucial phrase, $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \omega\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ in 1 Cor 9:21 and moves straight to the next phrase $\mu\eta\ \omega\upsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\ \epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Then, he explains the latter phrase thus: since "the law" always refers to "the Law of the Jews," the phrase means, "Paul is not 'outside the Law' like a Gentile; he is a Jew 'respecting the Law,'" and "he is Law-respecting 'under the aspect of Christ': he does not observe the Law as an aim in itself and standing alone but as one among various members of Christ's body" (p. 280). It is difficult to make sense of this explanation, but it certainly does not appear to be a correct interpretation of 1 Cor 9:21.

This critical examination of Tomson's interpretation of the crucial passage 1 Cor 9:19-22 leads to the conclusion that his attempt to demonstrate from that passage his presupposition that Paul faithfully maintained the Jewish halakic tradition is a failure, and therefore that his whole interpretation of Paul's teaching on *eidōlothuta* in 1 Cor 8-10 on the basis of that presupposition is not convincing. Apparently Tomson has developed that presupposition from his decision that "it is historically unimaginable that Jesus would have infringed upon the biblical food laws" (p. 241) and that Paul's identification of himself as a Jew meant that he was "under the Jewish Law" (p. 279) in its entirety, including the food/purity laws, because otherwise Paul would be wrongly portrayed "as the Apostle who indeed severed Christianity from Judaism and hence excommunicated Jewish followers of Jesus" (p. 228). If Jesus and Paul had been so faithfully observant of the Jewish law as Tomson presupposes, one wonders why they both were persecuted so severely by the Jews. At any rate, Tomson's efforts to interpret Paul's teaching solely within the framework of the rabbinic halaka leads him to see the Antiochian controversy in terms of the conflict between the Shammaite position represented by the men

of James and the Hillelite position represented by Paul (230-36). So Tomson goes so far as to explain Paul's standing up "for the truth of the gospel" (Gal 2:14) in effect as his standing up for the Hillelite halakic tradition! (p. 236). But this is forcefully to shut Paul's mouth, which testifies in Gal 1-2 of his conversion from a "zealotic" (Shammaite?) Pharisaism to Christ and his grace of salvation, and turn him back to his (alleged) Hillelite Judaism!

A fundamental problem with Tomson's interpretation of Paul is that his presupposition leaves little room for Paul's Christology to have an effect on his understanding of the law. In fact, Tomson explicitly denies an essential role of Christology in Paul's thinking (p. 273). But this not only ignores the Paul who speaks of Christ as "the end of the [Mosaic] law" (Rom 10:4) and therefore refers now to "the law of Christ," clearly differentiating it from the law of Moses (1 Cor 9:21; Gal 6:2), but also distorts Paul's thought so obviously that we do not need to waste our time disputing it. At any rate, with his baseless denial of the role of Christology in Paul's thinking and his unjustifiable presupposition about Paul's continued upholding of the Mosaic law and the Jewish halaka, Tomson makes his interpretation of Paul's teaching on the law as a whole, including the question of *eidōlothuta*, quite untenable.⁶⁵

While Tomson argues on the basis of the Jewish halaka, Alex T. Cheung argues on the basis of the OT for the view that Paul absolutely prohibits eating *eidōlothuta*, allowing only the eating of food that is not specified as such. As Tomson appeals to Paul's continuing Jewish character, Cheung similarly appeals to the fact that both Judaism and early Christianity forbade eating of *eidōlothuta*. As Tomson declares his dogmatic decision that "it is historically unimaginable that Jesus would have infringed upon the biblical food laws" (p. 241), so also Cheung declares his dogmatic decision: "That Paul himself had eaten, or had condoned eating, idol food was an unimaginable scenario for early Christians" (p. 104). Just as Christology plays no role in Tomson's interpretation of Paul's teaching on the law, so also it plays no role in Cheung's interpretation of Paul's teaching on *eidōlothuta*. To focus more sharply on our topic, just as Tomson silently passes over the phrase τοῖς ἀνόμοις ὡς ἄνομος and fails to interpret the phrase "in the law of Christ" in 1 Cor 9:21 properly, so also Cheung silently passes over both phrases (pp. 142-43). This multiple parallelism between Tomson and Cheung means that much of the above criticism of Tomson applies to Cheung also.

65. When Tomson denies any significant role of Christology in Paul's thinking, he, of course, remains only with a rabbinic Paul, a normal Jew determined by his halaka, whose teaching naturally has to be interpreted only in terms of the Jewish halaka. But, to say the least, this is certainly not the Paul of the NT.

To counter the majority view that in 8:7-10 Paul in principle grants the knowledge-boasters the right to eat *eidōlothuta*, so long as it does not cause the weak brothers to stumble, Cheung follows Gordon Fee's ineffective explanation that Paul develops his argument against *eidōlothuta*, in two stages, first on ethical ground (8:7-13) and then on theological (10:14-22; pp. 96, 102-3, 297).⁶⁶ However, in interpreting 1 Cor 10:23-30, Cheung parts company with Fee and joins with Tomson to argue that Paul allows eating only food whose religious history is not specified, because "one who has unknowingly eaten idol food would not be defiled" (pp. 152-60, 300, quotation from p. 153). So Cheung interprets Paul's advice not to make inquiry about the *eidōlothuton* nature of food for the sake of "conscience" (1 Cor 10:25, 27) in terms of this Jewish principle. But this only results in creating the impression that in the end Paul advises not to make the inquiry, lest its *eidōlothuton* character *should* be known (see pp. 152-53, 297, 300-01). The picture of Paul that we get from his letters is that he is liberated precisely from this sort of legalistic concern, and he advises Christians to live free of precisely this sort of legalistic anxiety. One wonders how with such a legalistic concern Paul could ever have been τοῖς ἀνόμοις ὡς ἄνομος. Whereas Tomson tries to buttress his interpretation of Paul's advice in 1 Cor 10:23-30 with the rabbinic halaka, Cheung appeals to some OT passages such as Exod 21:12-13, 28-29; and 22:2 for Paul's "somewhat casuistic approach to marketplace food and dinner invitations by unbelievers" (pp. 300-301). But the illustrations from Exodus appear quite farfetched. There is a world of difference between saying "you may eat what is really *eidōlothuton* if you do not know that it is" and saying "eat whatever is offered; do not make inquiry about it"! Cheung and Tomson think that in 1 Cor 10:25 and 27 Paul says the former, but I believe that he really say the latter. When Paul goes on to say in vv. 28-29 that, if someone reveals the *eidōlothuton* nature of food on a pagan dinner table, we should not eat it for the sake not of our "conscience" but the informer's "conscience," he clearly is allowing, in principle, the freedom of eating the food *made known as eidōlothuton*, except for the duty of respecting the "conscience" of the neighbor.

How effective, then, is Cheung's repeated insistence that Paul must be absolutely forbidding the eating of *eidōlothuta* because that

66. See above, pp. 10-11, contra Fee. According to Dawes, "Danger of Idolatry," 98, the difference between ch. 8 and ch. 10 is just a matter of Paul's rhetorical strategy: "in 8:7-13 the apostle responds to those having knowledge on their own grounds, while in 10:14-22 he introduces a new consideration in opposition to their behavior!" But how can it be explained away as a mere rhetorical strategy when, as Dawes himself admits, Paul "accepts the correctness of the knowledge [the knowledge-boasters] claim to have" (p. 92) and regards the "weak" as lacking "appropriate knowledge regarding the nonexistence of idols," agreeing with the former "that these people lack due enlightenment" (p. 96)?

was the universal position in Judaism and in early Christianity? (pp. 92, 97, 103, 109, 128, 140-41, 147, 278-84, 298-99). The Jewish evidence is obvious but hardly relevant to the Apostle Paul, because precisely with regard to questions such as *eidōlothuta* he differentiates himself from his former Pharisaic Jewish position in the light of the Christ-event (e.g., 1 Cor 7:12-14; 9:19-22; Rom 14:14-20; Gal 2:11-21). Cheung's comprehensive survey of the early Christian material on *eidōlothuta* (pp. 165-295) is indeed impressive.⁶⁷ However, given the strong biblical abhorrence of idolatry and the influence of the Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:28-29; cf. Rev 2:14, 20),⁶⁸ as well as the fact that Paul's doctrine of justification is almost completely forgotten in the post-apostolic age,⁶⁹ the absence of the influence of Paul's teaching on *eidōlothuta* in the early church is not inexplicable. Indeed, there may be an analogy or even some connection between the early Christians' almost universal flattening of Paul's carefully nuanced teaching into a simple prohibition and their replacing of Paul's doctrine of justification *sola gratia/fide* with a doctrine of works-righteousness. Clearly Cheung cannot comprehend how this could have happened, but to me Cheung and Tomson themselves, with their simplified reading of 1 Cor 8-10 in terms of an absolute prohibition of *eidōlothuta*, unwittingly demonstrate that it could always happen!

Therefore, instead of trying to settle the matter with an appeal to the early Christian interpretations of Paul's teaching, we must, first of all, carefully exegete the text of 1 Cor 8-10 itself and then consult the related texts such as Rom 14:1-15:13; Col 2:16; and 1 Tim 4:3-5 and Paul's theology of the law as a whole. Only after this can the weight of the early Christian evidence be considered. Space forbids me to show in detail the failures in Cheung's exegesis of 1 Cor 8-10,

67. Cf. also J. C. Brunt, "Rejected, Ignored, or Misunderstood? The Fate of Paul's Approach to the Problem of Food Offered to Idols in Early Christianity," *NTS* 31 (1985): 113-24.

68. Cf. J. Jervell, *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke—Acts and Early Christian History* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 34-35: "as a historical phenomenon [the decree] played a decisive role in the history of the church, for example, when it came to the question of the eating of consecrated food. No one followed what Paul recommended (1 Corinthians 8-9 and Romans 14-15), but we can see that Jewish-Christian policy gained ground." Besides the influence of the apostolic decree, Brunt, "Rejected, Ignored, or Misunderstood?" 120-22, rightly considers also how difficult Paul's complex argument and his ethical principle of love's responsibility in 1 Cor 8-10 must have been for early Christians who tended to use a proof text method of interpretation and to discuss such questions as *eidōlothuta* simply in terms of right or wrong.

69. T. Aono, *Die Entwicklung des paulinischen Gerichtsgedankens bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1979), 403, summarizes the result of his extensive survey of the Apostolic Fathers thus: "Die Reflexion der paulinischen Rechtfertigungsbotschaft ist aber jedenfalls mehr oder weniger konsequent durch die Werkgerechtigkeit ersetzt"

but above I have pointed out some of the problems with his interpretation of the crucial passages, 1 Cor 8:7-13; 9:19-22; and 10:23-30. It is also regrettable that Cheung ignores the significance of Rom 14-15 on the grounds that, there, Paul deals with the Jewish food laws, which he think are different from the questions about *eidōlothuta* treated in 1 Cor 8-10 (p. 136). It is true that the Jewish food laws treated in Rom 14-15 are broader than the questions about *eidōlothuta* treated in 1 Cor 8-10, and the nature of the conflicts between the "strong" and the "weak" in the two passages are not exactly the same. However, it is hardly possible to think that the two subject matters are totally unrelated or that when writing Rom 14-15 from Corinth only a couple of years after writing 1 Cor 8-10 Paul does not reflect in the former what he wrote in the latter. There are far too many similarities between the two passages! In fact, it is quite likely that the "weak" in Rom 14-15 avoid meat (14:21), eating only vegetables (14:2), at least partly for fear that the meat might be *eidōlothuton*. Therefore, Paul's declaration of all food as clean in itself (14:14, 20) and his teaching that the "strong" forego their right/freedom to eat meat if it causes the "weak" to stumble do shed light on our interpretation of 1 Cor 8-10, and they do so against Cheung's thesis.⁷⁰ Finally, if we consider Paul's teaching on *eidōlothuta* within the comprehensive framework of his theology of the law—which is fundamentally reshaped in the light of the Christ-event—the majority view on it is far more plausible than the view of Cheung and Tomson.

4. JESUS' TEACHING AND EXAMPLE AS WELL AS HIS DEATH

Our present study shows that, precisely in our context of Paul's dealing with *eidōlothuta*, Christology is decisive. This is recognized by Richard B. Hays when he identifies "the unity of the community and the imitation of Christ" as the "two fundamental norms" for Paul's ethical teaching in 1 Cor 8-10, as elsewhere.⁷¹ David Horrell has devoted a whole essay to demonstrating that "christological praxis" or "a christologically patterned orientation to others" is the guiding principle for Paul's treatment of *eidōlothuta* in 1 Cor 8-10, as it is for

70. See above, pp. 203-5.

71. R. B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the NT* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), 41-43; quotations from p. 41 In his essay "Christology and Ethics in Galatians: The Law of Christ," *CBQ* 49 (1987), 268-90, R. B. Hays shows that, also in Galatians, Christology ("the law of Christ" of Christ's pattern of self-giving) provides the decisive paradigm for the Christian life.

the whole of Pauline ethics.⁷² For this thesis, Horrell refers to Paul's designation of the knowledge-boasters' exercise of their right in disregard of the conscience of the weak as a "sin against Christ" (8:12; pp. 90-91), to Paul's "Christ-like self-giving" in accommodating to the needs of others (1 Cor 9:19-22; p. 95), to Paul's argument against idolatry in reference to the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper (10:16-17; pp. 97-98), and to Paul's explicit call in the concluding section of 1 Cor 10:23-11:1 for the Corinthians to imitate Christ by imitating him (pp. 102-4). Understanding "the law of Christ" in 1 Cor 9:21 in terms of the command to love in conformity to Christ,⁷³ Horrell also compares the imitation theme of 1 Cor 10:33-11:1 and 9:19-22 with that of Phil 2:4-11 as well as Rom 15:3.⁷⁴

The recognition by Hays and Horrell of the fundamental importance of the *imitatio Christi* theme in 1 Cor 8-10 and Pauline ethic as a whole may be regarded as an improvement upon the tendency of some critical Protestant scholars whom we have examined above.⁷⁵ However, they also narrowly concentrate only on Christ's self-sacrificing love in his death,⁷⁶ so that their thesis can hardly be said to represent a substantial improvement upon that of those reductionistic scholars. Hays even finds it significant that Paul deals with the question of *eidōlothuta* "not by pointing to the authoritative teaching of Jesus . . . but by urging [the 'strong'] to follow the example of Christ and the example of [his own] by surrendering their place of privilege."⁷⁷ Likewise, Horrell stresses that Paul lets imitating Christ's self-sacrifice override even a direct instruction of Jesus (1 Cor 9:14-15).⁷⁸

72. Horrell, "Theological Principle or Christological Praxis? Pauline Ethics in 1 Corinthians 8.1-11.1," quotation from p. 105. While he is right to stress the importance of "christological praxis," it is unfortunate that he contrasts it with "theological principle" and denies the latter's influence upon Paul's ethical teaching in 1 Cor 8-10 (pp. 105-9). Not only is Paul's "liberal" attitude to *eidōlothuta* fundamentally grounded on his theological decisions that monotheism excludes the real existence of an idol (8:4-8; 10:19) and that all God's creations are good (10:26), but Paul also explicitly refers to his abiding by the law of God (9:21) and exhorts his readers to make glorification of God their ultimate concern (10:31; cf. 8:6) and therefore to shun idolatry (10:14).

73. Here Horrell follows Schrage, *I Korinther (1 Kor 6,12-11,16)*, 345.

74. Horrell, "Theological Principle," 106.

75. Cf. *Ibid.*

76. Hays, *Moral Vision*, 43; Horrell, "Theological Principle," 91, 95, 102, 105-6. See further Hays, "Christology and Ethics in Galatians," 272-83.

77. Hays, *Moral Vision*, 43; cf. also *idem*, "Christology and Ethics in Galatians," 278: "It should be stressed that nothing is said here about any *teachings* of Jesus on humility and servanthood, nor is there any reference to historical incidents in Jesus' ministry such as healings or table-fellowship with 'sinners' or washing the feet of disciples. Paul focuses in a single-minded fashion on the decisive significance of Christ's incarnation and death" (his italics).

78. Horrell, "Theological Principle," 107, citing a similar statement of Schrage, *I Korinther (1 Kor 6,12-11,16)*, 310.

However, Paul's apparent transgression of Jesus' instruction for the preachers of the gospel to get their living by the gospel (1 Cor 9:14-15; cf. Luke 10:7/Matt 10:10) is only to set aside its letter in order to render a real obedience to its spirit or intention, as Horrell himself recognizes elsewhere.⁷⁹ Furthermore, we have seen above that for such a narrow conception of the example of Christ as Hays and Horrell suggest there are far too clear allusions in our context to various sayings of Jesus and to his conduct as well as to his self-giving in his death. We can underline this further by observing the fact that it is *precisely in 10:23-11.1, the concluding summary of Paul's whole teaching on eidōlothuta in chs. 8-10, and immediately before the call for imitation of Christ (11:1)* that there is a concentration of echoes of Jesus' sayings such as Mark 7:15 par. (1 Cor 10:25, 27; cf. 9:21), Mark 9:42-50 pars. (1 Cor 10:32, also 28; cf. 8:13), Mark 12:30 pars. (1 Cor 10:31; cf. 10:14), Mark 12:31 pars. (1 Cor 10:28, 32-33; cf. 9:19-22) and Mark 10:44-45 par. (1 Cor 10:33; cf. 9:19-22), *and of Jesus' conduct of dining with sinners* (1 Cor 10:27; cf. 9:21). Surely this fact strongly indicates that in the whole of Paul's teaching about *eidōlothuta* in 1 Cor 8-10 those sayings of Jesus as well as his act of self-sacrifice in his death (1 Cor 8:11; 10:33/Mark 10:45 par.) provide the guiding principles and that in his call for imitation of Christ Paul has in view Jesus' teaching and conduct as well as his self-giving love in his death. Therefore, in affirming the *imitatio Christi* paradigm as central for Paul's ethical teaching in 1 Cor 8-10, we must understand that Paul has in view Jesus' teaching and conduct as well as his self-sacrifice in his death.

This conclusion can be further supported with a number of considerations. Paul's citation of Jesus' mission charge in 1 Cor 9:14 indicates that while delivering his teaching on *eidōlothuta* (1 Cor 8-10) Paul actually is conscious of the historical Jesus and his teaching. This inference can be drawn also from the fact that in the neighboring context Paul cites the actual teaching of Jesus to use as a principle for his teaching on divorce (1 Cor 7:10-11). The great reverence that Paul pays to the command of the Lord Jesus in this citation (compare 1 Cor 7:10 with 7:12 and 25) strengthens the inference still further. With regard to his teaching in the same context that mixed marriages should not be dissolved, Paul provides the theological basis that the unbelieving spouses are sanctified through the believing spouses (rather than that the believing spouses are defiled through their unbelieving spouses; 1 Cor 7:12-1[4]). This is a remarkable statement for a former

79. D. Horrell, "'The Lord commanded. . . . But I have not used': Exegetical and Hermeneutical Reflections on 1 Cor. 9.14-15," *NTS* 43 (1997): 600, agreeing with this interpretation of mine in S. Kim, "Jesus, Sayings of," *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (ed. G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin, and D. G. Reid; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 475, reprinted in S. Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective*, 261.

"zealotic" Pharisee, as this principle of sanctification by association effectively overturns his former Pharisaic principle of defilement by association.⁸⁰ It is most unlikely that Paul has developed this new theological conviction completely independent of Jesus' "infamous" practice of associating with sinners and other unclean people to make them "clean" or holy people of God (Mark 1:40-45 pars.; 2:15-17 pars.; 5:25-34 pars.; Matt 11:19/Luke 7:34; Luke 19:1-10; etc.).

We have already drawn on Rom 14:14-20 to shed light on Paul's implicit use of Jesus' teaching on food and purity (Mark 7:15/Matt 15:10) in 1 Cor 8-10. In Rom 15:1-3, which is rather similar in language and thought structure to 1 Cor 10:33-11:1, Paul refers to the example of Christ in his self-sacrifice. At the conclusion of his treatment of the conflict about food between the "strong" and the "weak" in Rom 14:1-15:13, Paul exhorts the Romans: "Receive one another, therefore, as Christ has received you" (Rom 15:7; cf. 14:1). The exhortation comes on the heels of his warning not to lay any "stumbling block (πρόσκομμα) or hindrance (σκάνδαλον)" in front of a brother (Rom 14:13-23; cf. 1 Cor 8:9, 13; 10:32), which seems to echo Jesus' saying not to "put a hindrance (σκανδαλίξειν) before one of these little ones" (Matt 18:6/Mark 9:42/Luke 17:1). So it may be echoing Jesus' saying for the disciples to "receive" children (Matt 18:5/Mark 9:37/Luke 9:48), as in Matt 18:5-6 this saying appears similarly joined with the σκανδαλίξειν saying.⁸¹ If so, here again Paul includes Jesus' teaching in the idea of imitating his example.

In 1 Thess 1:6, Paul congratulates the Thessalonian Christians for having become "imitators" (μιμηταί) of himself and "of the Lord" by accepting the gospel, with the joy of the Holy Spirit, in spite of much persecution. Clearly Paul is thinking here of Jesus' bearing, with the joy of the Holy Spirit, the persecution of his opponents for his preaching of the gospel (Matt 12:28/Luke 11:20; Luke 10:21; cf. also Luke 6:22-23; Heb 12:2). Just as Paul himself is (2 Cor 6:10; 8:2), so also now the Thessalonians are imitators of the Lord Jesus in this regard. Thus, in 1 Thess 1:6 Paul is making abundantly clear not only that the historical Jesus⁸² is the object of imitation but also that his gladly bearing persecution for the gospel is a point for imitation. Of

80. Cf. Ezra 9-10; Neh 13:23-30; *m. Git.* 9:2 against marriage with a Gentile. Cf. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 118-19; also Sanders, "Jewish Association with Gentiles," 170-88 (esp. p. 177).

81. So Wenham, *Paul*, 262-64. See Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 233, for echoes of Mark 10:45/Matt 20:28 and Matt 15:24 in Rom 15:8.

82. By designating as "the Lord" the earthly Jesus who suffered affliction because of his preaching of the gospel, Paul here nullifies all the attempts to suggest that he distinguishes the exalted Lord from the earthly Jesus or that with the imitation theme he thinks only of the incarnation of the preexistent or exalted Lord.

course, the persecution that Jesus bore for the sake of the gospel climaxed in his crucifixion. But it would be quite arbitrary if we insist that here Paul has in view only that climax divorced from the opposition and persecution by Jesus' opponents which eventually led to it. With his theme of *imitatio Christi* Paul does not always think only of Christ's incarnation and death or his self-sacrifice!

Nevertheless, the immediate connection of 1 Cor 11:1 with 10:33 does lead us to see Paul's emphasis falling on the imitation of Christ's act of self-giving in his death, because 10:33 echoes Jesus' saying about his self-sacrificial death (Mark 10:45 par.).⁸³ To understand this properly, however we must first appreciate what it means that in 1 Cor 10:33-11:1 Paul brings out the character of Christ's death as an act of self-sacrifice *by echoing Jesus' own saying about his death*. It means that Paul interpret Christ's death as an act of self-sacrifice for our salvation not just because he accepts the primitive church's kerygma, but more basically because he understands Christ's death in terms of Jesus' own interpretation of it. If Paul had originally learned from the kerygma that "Christ died for us/for our sins" (1 Cor 15:3; Gal 1:3-4; 1 Thess 5:9-10; etc.), he must have had it confirmed by the dominical logion—that is, Jesus' own interpretation of his death. This has a great implication for Paul's theological method⁸⁴ as well as for the whole Jesus-Paul debate. It is simply impossible to say that Paul concentrates only on the kerygma of the church or Christ's death in it, ignoring the life and teaching of the historical Jesus. When Paul thinks of Christ's self-sacrificial death, he does not think of it as an isolated event (not to speak of an abstract principle), like a mathematical point, without any line connecting to the life of the earthly Jesus. On the contrary, 1 Cor 10:33-11:1 shows that Paul thinks of Christ's death in full consciousness of the Jesus who went to that death, speaking of it as a sacrifice for the redemption of many. Therefore, in 1 Cor 10:33-11:1 Paul is presenting as an example for his and our imitation precisely that Christ, or that Jesus, who went to his death, speaking of it as a sacrifice for the salvation of many.

83. The statement in 11:1 is the grand conclusion of 1 Cor 8-10 as a whole. Hence, the call to "be imitators of me" is not related just to Paul's example in 10:32-33 but also to his example in 8:13 and its elaboration throughout ch. 9 (esp. 9:19-23). So the reference to his imitating of Christ in 11:1 must be understood likewise as covering his following of Christ's teachings and conduct that is suggested throughout chs. 8-10. Yet it cannot be denied that with the immediate connection of 11:1 to 10:33 Paul puts stress on imitating Christ's self-sacrifice in his death.

84. Concerning Paul's theological method of seeing Jesus' claim and the early church's kerygma confirmed by the Damascus revelation and then interpreting that revelation in the light of the Jesus tradition as well as the Scriptures, and vice versa, see my *Paul and the New Perspective*, 126-27, 194-208, 238, 257 (n. 59), 259-90, 296-97.

While thus resisting any attempt to see Paul as considering Christ's death in isolation from his earthly life and teaching, 1 Cor 10:33-11:1 nevertheless does show Paul as focusing on Christ's death. The fact that in giving the grand conclusion to his whole teaching of 1 Cor 8-10 in these two verses Paul echoes the saying about Jesus' death in Mark 10:45 par. clearly suggests that he thinks of Christ's death as the culminating demonstration of Jesus' sacrificial service, and as such, as the clearest model for his and our imitation. The parallelism between 10:32-11:1 and 9:19-22 with their common echoes of Mark 10:45 par. produces the same effect. This impression naturally leads us to link the *imitatio Christi* call here with the similar calls in Phil 2:5-11 (cf. also 3:10-17) and 2 Cor 8:9 (cf. Rom 15:1-3). These verses describe the example of Christ's self-emptying and self-giving in his incarnation and death in the most striking terms, and they concentrate on his incarnation and death, without pausing to reflect on either his teaching or exemplary conduct between these two points of his life. Furthermore, there is a heavy concentration on Christ's death (and resurrection) throughout the Pauline epistles. So it is understandable that under the overwhelming impression of these facts scholars have narrowly focused on the dimension of Christ's self-sacrificing death in the *imitatio Christi* call of 1 Cor 11:1, too. Therefore, when we consider the theme of *imitatio Christi* in Paul's letters as a whole, it is quite proper to stress the dimension of Christ's self-giving love in his death (and incarnation)⁸⁵ as central to the theme. In view of 1 Cor 10:33, it is also proper to see that dimension central in the *imitatio Christi* call of 1 Cor 11:1, too. Here it is pleaded only that the recognition of its *centrality* should not lead to ignoring the dimension of following the earthly Jesus' teaching and exemplary conduct also involved in that call. First Corinthians 10:33 itself, being an echo of Jesus' saying about his own death, prevents us from doing this.

A. J. M. Wedderburn argues that with his Gentile mission Paul was following Jesus' acceptance of sinners into the Kingdom of God, of which he had learned from the Hellenists,⁸⁶ and C. Wolff delineates four aspects of life and ministry showing parallels between Jesus and Paul (deprivation, celibacy, humble service, and suffering persecution), concluding that Paul was "a true follower" of Jesus.⁸⁷ Endorsing Wolff's judgment, Wedderburn suggests further that the

85. Cf. A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Paul and the Story of Jesus," in *Paul and Jesus* (ed. A. J. M. Wedderburn; JSNTS 37; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 188-89, for Paul's projecting the image of the self-sacrificing Christ from his death backward into prehistory for affirmation of his self-emptying in the incarnation.

86. Wedderburn, "Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity," in *ibid.*, 130-43, 180.

87. Wolff, "Humility and Self-Denial in Jesus' Life and Message and in the Apostolic Existence of Paul," in *ibid.*, 145-60; quotation from p. 160.

lists of virtues that Paul exhorts Christians to have (1 Cor 13:4-7; Gal 5:22-23) could "stem ultimately from the remembered character of the earthly Jesus."⁸⁸ So, in the macro-context of the Pauline epistles as a whole as well as in our chosen passage of 1 Cor 8-10, we can affirm that Paul tried to follow the teaching of the historical Jesus and imitate his example. At the same time, Wedderburn emphasizes the centrality for Paul of Jesus' self-sacrificing death in the story of Jesus, observing that from the viewpoint of Jesus' death "Paul evaluates both the rest of Jesus earthly life and the other-worldly part of his story, and all must be consistent with this."⁸⁹ However, Wedderburn argues about the importance of Jesus' earthly life for Paul's assertions about Christ's incarnation, too:

If Jesus had behaved self-assertively in his earthly life, appeal to the example of his self-denial in his incarnation (2 Cor 8.9; Phil 2.6-7) would be . . . at least obstructed and vitiated: Paul's converts could then reasonably ask which example of Jesus they were to follow, and could claim that they preferred to follow the self-seeking earthly Jesus rather than the self-denying heavenly one.⁹⁰

The same argument can be applied to the relationship between Jesus' death and the rest of his earthly life just as well as between his incarnation and his earthly life. At any rate, all these considerations confirm that, in thinking of imitating Christ, Paul has in view the life and teaching of the earthly Jesus as well as his death. Jesus' self-sacrificing death was the conclusion of his whole self-giving life as well as the supreme demonstration of his teaching about self-giving love. Hence Paul finds it to provide the strongest motivating power for his moral exhortation. About this, M. Thompson writes well:

For Paul, the death and resurrection of Jesus inaugurated the eschaton, thus eclipsing in significance all of his words and deeds leading up to the Passion. Why should Paul point to an act of love, humility, or compassion during Jesus' ministry when he could cite his example of total commitment on the cross? Why should he cite a healing power, when he could refer to the resurrection? Everything Jesus said and did before his death and vindication paled in significance by comparison to the Christ-Event.⁹¹

88. Wedderburn, "Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity," 180, referring to J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM, 1975), 321.

89. Wedderburn, "Paul and Jesus," 181-89; quotation from p. 187. Wedderburn (p. 181) refers to H. Weder, *Das Kreuz. Jesu bei Paulus* (FRLANT 125; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 229, who understands Jesus' *Geschichte* as "summarized and concentrated in his death on the cross."

90. Wedderburn, "Paul and Jesus," 182.

91. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 73.

This discussion makes it clear why in his ethical exhortation Paul focuses on Jesus' self-sacrifice in his death and (by extension) in his incarnation. But it also makes it clear how Paul leaves sufficiently clear allusions to or echoes of the teachings and exemplary conduct of the earthly Jesus and how he sees them so consistent with Jesus' self-sacrificing death as to be summarized by it.

Together with the fact that for Paul Christ is no longer an earthly figure and no mere earthly figure, this focusing on Jesus' self-giving in his death (and incarnation) probably lies behind Paul's dropping the terminology of ἀκολουθεῖν of the Gospel tradition and instead using the terminology of μιμητής; exclusively, although he includes following the teaching and example of the earthly Jesus in his conception of imitating Christ.

5. CONCLUSION

Now we may gather up the results of our investigation and reflect on their implications. In dealing with the problem of *eidōlothuta* in 1 Cor 8-10, Paul follows Jesus' *teachings*: the absolute demand of love for God and for neighbor as embodied in Jesus' double commandment of love (Mark 12:28-34 pars.) and in his other sayings (Mark 9:42-50 pars.; 10:44-45 par.), and his teaching about food and purity (Mark 7:15 par.), as well as his *conduct* exemplifying these teachings: his self-giving for others unto death (1 Cor 8:11) and his free association with sinners. Since Paul echoes such sayings of Jesus and such conduct of his especially clearly in the crucial passages, 1 Cor 8:13; 9:19-22; and 10:23-33, where he gives himself as an example for the Corinthians' imitation, saying that he himself is an imitator of Christ (11:1), it is clear that in seeking to imitate Christ Paul has in view these teachings and the conduct of Jesus. Seeing, however, that Paul gives a grand conclusion to his long discussion of *eidōlothuta* with an echo of Jesus' saying about his self-giving death for redemption of many (Mark 10:45/1 Cor 10:33) and with a call to imitate him as an imitator of Christ (11:1), we have to recognize the centrality of Christ's death for Paul's idea of *imitatio Christi*.

Thus, showing how Paul follows the concrete teachings and conduct of Jesus as well as how he makes his climactic reference to Christ's death in terms of Jesus' own interpretation of it, 1 Cor 8-10 teaches us that with regard to Paul's idea of *imitatio Christi* we are to affirm the centrality of Christ's death, though not as an isolated event divorced from Jesus' life and teaching but rather as their climax. Clearly for Paul, Jesus' self-sacrifice in his death on the cross is the supreme demonstration of his teaching of love as well as the climax of his exemplary life of self-giving. Therefore, while recognizing the

centrality of Christ's death for Paul's ethic as well as his theology, we must also pay due attention to Paul's following Jesus' teachings and example.

With this main result of this investigation, we can affirm the following three subsidiary results as well. (1) This study has confirmed the traditional majority view of Paul's treatment of *eidōlothuta*. (2) It has further shown that Paul's excellent advice about *eidōlothuta* that so wonderfully balances Christian freedom with the Christian duty of love is, at least in part, the result of his appropriation of Jesus' teachings and example. Paul does not just indirectly suggest this through his echoing of Jesus' sayings and conduct, but in fact directly indicates this in our passage through his claim to follow "the law of Christ" and the example of Christ (1 Cor 9:21; 11:1). (3) What is perhaps even more significant than these results is that this study has strengthened the cases for the authenticity of such crucial sayings of Jesus as Mark 7:15 par.; 9:42-50 pars.; 10:45 par.; and 12:28-34 pars., as they seem to be used by Paul as Jesus' teachings in 1 Cor 8-10. Clearly Paul knew the logion Mark 10:45 par.; indeed he valued it so much as to echo it twice in our text (9:19; 10:33; cf. 1 Tim 2:5-6).⁹² The great implications that this fact has for his understanding of Jesus' death, for the Jesus-Paul debate, and indeed the whole question of the rise of the post-Easter Church's kerygma, and even for the quest of the historical Jesus can scarcely be exaggerated.

With these results, this study bears significantly on two further points. By making it clear that Paul knew and used effectively some concrete saying and the example of Jesus for his teaching, this study leads us to stress the importance of the historical Jesus for Paul's theology and ethic. Further, the way Paul used Jesus' teachings and exemplary conduct as his guiding principles in dealing with the problem of *eidōlothuta* that he faced in his Gentile mission field has a paradigmatic significance for our hermeneutical and theological endeavors in our missionary situations.

A study on the Pauline theme of *imitatio Christi* would not be complete without a consideration of its relationship to another Pauline theme, namely, the idea of Christians being conformed (συμμορφῶσθαι) to or transformed (μεταμορφῶσθαι) into the image (εἰκῶν) of

92. The context in which Paul echoes the logion of Mark 10:45 par., namely, those of his speaking about his following the "law of Christ" and the example of Christ, indicate his appreciation of it still further. See n. 50 above for the view that Paul's references to the "law of Christ" and the example of Christ in 9:21 and 11:1, respectively, are "tradition indicators" for allusions to or echoes of the logia of Mark 7:15 par.; 9:42-50 pars.; 10:45 par.; and 12:28-34 pars. All these suggest that Paul's use of such dominical logia as demonstrated in this essay should be counted as a case of multiple attestation for their authenticity (I owe this last point to David Lowery, my respondent).

Christ (Rom 8:29; 1 Cor 15:49; 2 Cor 3:18; Phil 3:20-21; Col 3:9-10; cf. Eph 4:22-24), who is the image (εἰκὼν) of God (2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15; cf. Phil 2:6). How did Paul relate the two themes to each other (cf. Phil 2:1-30 and 3:10-11; 2 Cor 4:10)? This question is neglected in scholarship. Having stressed the latter theme as a distinctive and important Pauline theme overarching soteriology and ethics,⁹³ I feel the urgency of the question. However, it cannot be treated within the confines of this essay, and it will have to remain a task for another day and a sequel to the present essay.

93. See S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (WUNT 2/4; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981; 2d ed. 1984; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 135-268 (esp. pp. 223-33), 315-27; *Paul and the New Perspective*, 165-213.