

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Christian Brethren Review* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_christian-brethren-review.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_christian-brethren-review.php)

# **Women's Church and Communion Participation: Apostolic Practice or Innovative Twist?**

GERALD L. ALMLIE

The purpose of this paper is to present a scriptural middle position between the traditional and egalitarian extremes by harmonising Paul's seemingly contradictory Corinthian permission (1 Cor.11:5) with his prohibition (1 Cor.14:34-35). If such a middle position can be sustained scripturally, it will force careful re-examination and re-evaluation of basic assumptions.

The major difficulty of both traditional and egalitarian positions has been the assumption that Paul's Corinthian permission and prohibition operated in the context of the same church meeting. However, if Paul and his first-century readers distinguished between different types of church meetings, his permission and his prohibition can be given equal weight and authority without any necessity to assume that Paul contradicted himself, his Lord, or scripture.

## **Controls**

Do we recognise the dangers of current hermeneutical trends to pick bible teachings which are compatible with our times and culture? While there is nothing wrong with distinguishing between scriptural commands and principles meant for all people at all times from those limited to a specific time and people, the interpreter of scripture is not free to disregard commands and principles which scripture intended to be obeyed.

"Cultural understanding may illuminate the text, but it must not be allowed to contradict or set aside the plain statement of scripture."<sup>1</sup> Also moulding scriptural teaching "by contemporary human behaviour is exactly the opposite of what is intended by revelation. The bible was intended to create a culture, not to be moulded by it."<sup>2</sup> Do we rise to the level of scripture and its understanding, or do we pull scripture down to our level?

It may however be difficult to recognise the distinctive merits of the proposed middle position after sounding out or responding to theological thunder for or against egalitarian extremes.<sup>3</sup> Any middle

position draws fire from both these extremes, each having some truth to support its claims.

### Context

The proper interpretational value has not yet been accorded either to the relationship of Paul's permission (1 Cor.11:5) with his prohibition (1 Cor.14:34-35) or to their relationship with Paul's own working outline of answering the specific Corinthian questions directed to him (1 Cor.7:1-16:12). Paul's responses to the Corinthian questions are prefaced by the Greek phrase *peri de* (1 Cor.7:1,25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1,12). After considering *peri de* at Mark 12:26; 13:32; John 16:11; and Acts 21:25, Faw concludes the phrase was (1) a formula of reply to specific questions or problems, especially where there is a series of such; (2) in series of replies it is properly used to introduce those from the second point onward; (3) in Pauline usage it is confined to answering of specific questions or problems brought up in letters from the churches to which he is writing.<sup>4</sup>

A simple study of the above references suggests two simple conclusions: (1) *peri de* may introduce a new subject *with implied contrast to what preceded*, or (2) it may introduce a second or third response to a specific question concerning a different aspect of the same general topic, with or without any intended contrast to what preceded it. Consequently, *peri de* alone does not indicate contrast *per se* as much as is implied by the context, the change of subject matter. This preliminary information is needed to understand the positioning of Paul's permission (1 Cor.11:5 and its immediate context of 11:2-16) within its larger controlling context. Once this is done, harmonising Paul's permission with his prohibition is much easier.

There are four major possibilities of understanding the overall relationship of Paul's permission with its larger controlling context.

One view holds that all of Paul's permission (1 Cor.11:2-16) begins a new section on christian order, but it refers to gatherings *outside the normal church meeting* because it lacks vital connection to what follows. This conservative view is commendable because it seeks to give equal weight to Paul's permission and his prohibition, without assuming that he contradicted himself. However, Paul's permission is vitally linked to 'the Lords supper' section following, so that all of 1 Cor. 11:2-34 is a chiasmic unity, the proof of which must be deferred until later.

A second and common view holds that 1 Cor.11:2 with perhaps 16:3 refers to different aspects of the same church meeting, and Paul

merely noted women's participation in passing in chapter 11, deferring his express disapproval until chapter 14:34-35. It is claimed this view is supported by Paul's seeming approval of eating at a pagan ceremony (1 Cor.8:10) while deferring his condemnation of the same act until later (1 Cor.10:14-21). While the context demonstrates that Paul used two arguments concerning the same issue of eating food at pagan temples (1 Cor.8:1-10:22) different from the arguments concerning eating sacrificed food elsewhere (1 Cor.10:23-11:1),<sup>5</sup> does that necessitate Paul's treating women's participation in the same way? Of course not! This analogy assumes Paul had the same church meeting in mind for both his permission and his prohibition; this study challenges that basic assumption.

A third view holds that the *peri de* at 1 Cor.12:1 contrasts the chiastic unity containing Paul's prohibition (1 Cor.12:1-14:40) with the previous chiastic unity containing Paul's permission (1 Cor.11:2-34). Each chiastic unity with its specific church meeting is contrasted with the other rather than describing different aspects of the same general church meeting. A detailed study of the content of the two chiastic unities would reveal definite contrast.

However, there is a fourth view which may be more natural than the third view. The whole of Paul's permission (1 Cor.11:2-34) is a natural appendix to his discussion concerning christian liberty about eating in a pagan society (1 Cor.8:1-11:1). The communal meal of the Lord's supper is mentioned in both 10:16-21 and 11:20-34; both concern eating and drinking. On the other hand, the context of Paul's prohibition (1 Cor.14:34-35) is part of his distinct unity pertaining to order and the use of spiritual gifts (1 Cor.12:1-14:40). Chapter 15 concerns the resurrection and is a natural appendix to Paul's discussion of orderly use of spiritual gifts suggested by the implied doctrinal content of what is taught within the teaching meeting of chapter 14. Only in the two appendices does Paul use the introductory formula 'I delivered' (1 Cor.11:2, 23; 15:3).

In addition Paul seems to have fashioned his replies in somewhat of a symmetrical fashion which also favours the fourth view. The occurrences and placements of *peri de*, the appended chapters to the larger sections, and the relative length of the sections suggest the following symmetrical outline: A—7:1, 25 (short), B—8:1 with appended 11:2—34 (long), B'—12:1 with appended 15:1—58 (long), A'—16:1, 12 (short). It would appear Paul conceived of his permission and related chiastic unity (1 Cor.11:2-34) as an appendix or outgrowth of discussing the social issues of eating and drinking in pagan society for believers. Therefore, the controlling context is found in the chapters (8:1-11:1) prior to his permission (11:2-34), not in the

chapters following (12:1-14:40) which contain his prohibition (14:34-35). The *peri de* of 12:1 introduces a new subject.

Of the views presented, the fourth is the most probable, but the third is also possible. Either harmonises Paul's Corinthian permission with his prohibition on the basis of two different apostolic church meetings: (1) the Lord's supper in which men and women participated equally as priests, and (2) the teaching meeting in which only a limited number of men participated. Now these claims must be sustained by specific evidence.

### Chiasmus

While chiasmus or introversion is defined as two or more words, phrases, ideas, or subjects presented together and then repeated in reverse order, it seems to be a term remembered from training as a hermeneutical tool but thereafter forgotten or confined to technical journals.

Yet chiasmus may prove extremely helpful for accurate interpretation. For example, the well-known introverted pattern A B B' A' of Matthew 7:6 clarifies the interpretation: the dogs (A) turn and rend (A'); the pearls before pigs (B) will be trampled under foot (B'). "What may be obscure in one member may be clear in its corresponding member."<sup>6</sup>

Not only one verse but also many verses may be clarified by noting their chiastic form. By explicit use of chiasmus, readers would have "consciously or unconsciously sensed" an author's intended unity, cohesion, and interrelation of thought.<sup>7</sup> Since Paul had a "predilection for chiasmus and old testament parallelism,"<sup>8</sup> they must be considered for accurate interpretation. If not, the resultant hermeneutic could be less than complete. Such is true for 1 Cor.11:2-34.

While the first part of Paul's permission contains three distinct chiastic forms (1 Cor.11:4-7, 8-12, and 13-16), these will not be commented upon except to illustrate the corresponding balance with the latter half of the chapter.

Careful study of the general chiastic outline of chapter 11 in Figure 1 (facing) reveals a very natural and orderly flow of its differing but related content. The correspondence of XB and XC to ZB' and ZC' respectively is clear, but the authoritative proclamation<sup>9</sup> of 11:26 requires some comment.

While the object is expressed, the indirect object is not. Who were the recipients of the authoritative proclamation of the Lord's death? The verb is active without any reflexive pronoun, so it was not to the



believers present. It was not to unbelievers because they were not present each time.<sup>10</sup> The correspondence of XC overtly (11:10) with ZC' covertly (11:26) indicates Paul meant 'angels' or the spirit world.

XD and ZD' are the only sections of the chapter having articular reference to 'the church(es) of God' (1 Cor.11:16,22). They have the only questions within the chapter. They also are essentially detailed conclusions within their respective systems.<sup>11</sup>

Objectively such corresponding agreements cannot be accidental. Since Paul had used chiastic structure in the first half of the chapter, it was reasonable for him to have used it for the second half as well, especially if Paul conceived that the different subject matter had an essential unity or relationship. While seemingly unrelated, head-coverings possess very close inner unity of proper decorum in praying, speaking, eating, and drinking together at the same meeting.<sup>12</sup>

In Y (11:17-19) the transitional 11:17 is essential, but 11:18-19 is parenthetical. The last Greek word of 11:17 and the first major Greek words of 11:18 and 20 are the same word 'coming together,' but with different inflections. Now when *like sentence endings and beginnings* occur, "the words so repeated are thus emphasised as being the most important words in the sentence, which we are to mark and consider in translation and exposition."<sup>13</sup> One could easily connect the end of transitional 11:17 with the beginning of 11:20 without any disruption of thought. Therefore, 11:18-19 is parenthetical to Paul's main thought, but 11:17 is essential as transition.<sup>14</sup>

Without grasping the chiastic unity of 1 Cor.11, many have a distinct dichotomy between the 'praise' of 11:2 and the 'no praise' of 11:17. However, Findlay has stated that 11:3f. "rectified an error," and 11:17f. "censure a glaring fault" because both verses "detract, in different degrees, from the 'praise' of verse 2."<sup>15</sup> A. T. Robertson tersely commented concerning 11:3: "I wish you to know, censure in contrast to the praise in verse 2."<sup>16</sup> Paul's censuring and correcting of 11:3-16 and 17-34 all detract from his praise of verse 2. Therefore determining that a dichotomy existed within 1 Cor.11 upon the basis of 'praise' for 11:2-16 and 'no praise' for 11:17-34 is an inaccurate oversimplification; the chapter is unified by its chiastic structure.

### Concord

The first three Greek words of 1 Cor.11:17 translated as 'Now commanding this' require some careful thought. While the near demonstrative pronoun 'this' is first and emphatic and closer to the participle 'commanding' than to the principal verb 'praise' in Greek,

Arndt and Gingrich from their translation of Bauer's fourth edition list 'this' as the direct object of 'praise' and translate the participle absolutely 'in giving my instructions.'<sup>17</sup> It seems more natural on the basis of Greek word order, however, to understand 'this' as the direct object of closer 'commanding' as have many critical commentaries and as have Thayer and Abbott-Smith.<sup>18</sup> It also seems more natural to take 'this' as the direct object of 'commanding' because the principal verb 'praise' has the expected 'that' (*hoti*) clause following it which further explains why Paul was not praising the Corinthians.<sup>19</sup>

But what is the reference or antecedent of 'this'? Normally pronouns refer back to what has already been mentioned; yet Greek grammar is flexible enough to sustain Arndt and Gingrich and others who prefer to interpret 'this' as referring to what follows. Where scholars differ, it is apparent that one's presuppositions about the context greatly determine the resulting interpretation. If one assumes basic incompatibility between the two halves of chapter 11 for whatever reason, then it logically follows that 'this' must refer to what follows, not to what preceded.

However, I believe the most natural and least forced reference of 'this' is that it refers to what preceded. The closest would be Paul's command to the Corinthian believers to judge among themselves whether or not it was proper for a woman to pray to God uncovered (11:13-16). Of course, all of 11:3-16 could also be included, since 11:13-16 is the conclusion of Paul's previous argument.

It is elementary to state that the action of the present participle 'commanding' takes place at the same time as the action of the leading verb 'praise' with its 'that' (*hoti*) clause. But once one identifies the antecedent of emphatic 'this' at the beginning of 11:17 with what preceded it and then identifies the 'coming together' at the end of 11:17 with 11:20 with like sentence endings and beginnings, then the antecedent of women's active praying and the Lord's supper are scripturally connected to the same time and occasion by the transitional 11:17, connecting both halves of chapter 11.

In other words, Paul grammatically and chiasmatically balanced correction of the head-covering problem with correction of the improper eating and drinking problem at the Lord's supper. Solving the first did not automatically solve the second. The two problems were related because they occurred at the same church meeting, the Lord's supper. Not only was Paul's chiasmic grouping logical and practical, but also such grouping demonstrated that Paul himself saw no contradiction with women's active praying at the Lord's supper. If Paul and the early church then saw no contradiction, there ought not to be any contradiction today. Therefore, if the Lord's supper is

relevant for today (Cor.11:26), then women's active praying at that meeting is also relevant for today.

### Customs

Because the Lord's supper was a communal meal, an eating meeting, it may be important to remember that the Greek, Roman, and Jewish dining customs for the ordinary principal meal were very similar. Families, specifically the husband and wife, normally ate their principal meal together, not separately. There would be conversation during that meal. People normally reclined while eating or sat on or near the dining couch when crowded. At the conclusion of the meal hands had to be washed because the fingers were used extensively. The dishes were cleared, and the furniture could be rearranged for evening activities. The men had greater freedom after the principal meal to go to the gatherings at other homes. Those who had not been previously invited to the principal meal could be asked to join in the activities of the evening.<sup>20</sup>

The point is that men and women ate their principal meals together and they talked together during that meal. The Passover, as foundational to the Lord's supper, was a family gathering with special religious significance. Yet Paul's prohibition (1 Cor.14:34-35) is widely explained as being prompted by the eastern custom of seating the sexes separately during meetings. If men and women had been seated together, the women could have questioned their men beside them instead of asking 'at home' (14:35). Paul meant therefore that the women were not to disturb the meeting by calling across the room to ask questions. The continuation by the church of the synagogue practice of separate seating for men and women has substantial support, but the apostolic church celebrated the Lord's supper as a communal meal. Are we to suppose that men and women, husbands and wives sat separately at that meal when Greek, Roman, and Jewish families normally ate their ordinary meals together? I do not think so. Activities before or after the principal meal could provide for separate seating quite easily, especially afterwards.

On the basis of this inference of sitting together for the Lord's supper and of sitting separately for the teaching meeting, one may doubt that Paul had in mind different aspects of the same meeting. If the seating were changed, there would appear to have been a change in focus — a different meeting.

## Contrasts

The old testament recorded two divinely appointed orders of ministry: priests and prophets. The priest's work was essentially sacrifice and intercession in *representing man to God*, but the prophet's work was essentially revelation and instruction in *representing God to man*.<sup>21</sup> While the two orders complement each other, they also contrast with each other. It is the broad contrast between the two orders which may help in interpreting the overall thrust of Paul's Corinthian permission and prohibition.

While there were no divinely appointed female priests in the old testament, the new testament revealed a priesthood composed of all male and female believers. Each priest is equal before God and their fellow priests.

Now notice the order of subjects Paul concerns himself with in 1 Cor. 11:4-5. By synecdoche (by which one example is put for all other similar things)<sup>22</sup> the term *praying* includes all kinds of man's *speaking to God* while *prophesying* includes all kinds of God's *speaking to man*. Thereafter he emphasises prayer (11:13-16, 24-25), but in chapters 12-14 he concerns himself with spiritual gifts (although tongues has both a 'to God' and a 'to man' aspect).

My point is that chapter 11 emphasises prayer which is priestly and that chapters 12-14 generally emphasise spiritual gifts which are largely prophetic. If the Lord's supper is priestly and the teaching meeting is prophetic, two different foci are evident. Some prayer at the teaching meeting does not change it into a prayer meeting. Prayer at the Lord's supper with its focus upon the character and work of our Saviour (1 Cor. 11:24-25) does not change it into a general prayer meeting. If there is one focus at a church meeting, then two foci indicate either two church meetings or two totally separate foci at the same meeting.

## Confirmations

Is there any objective evidence from the church's early history which confirms any distinction between church meetings or comments upon women's participation? While it is understood that Acts, our only canonical church history, does not teach doctrine as the epistles do, any evidence of apostolic practice may be helpful in clarifying comments in the epistles. At the Jerusalem church all the activities of the apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayers (Acts 2:42, 46; cf. 5:12,42) were not done at the same meeting. A simple comparison of Acts 2:42 with verse 46 indicates two separate meeting

places for the Jerusalem church: the temple and the home. Quite clearly the Lord's supper was celebrated in homes, not at the temple.

Lest one think only the Jerusalem church had separate meetings at different physical locations because of their special local situation, there is strong contextual evidence that the Troas church, approximately twenty-two years after Pentecost and 750 miles northwest of Jerusalem, also differentiated between meetings at their one physical location (Acts 20:6-12).

Critical to the 'differentiating foci' view of meetings is the proper understanding and subsequent translation of the genitive absolute, 'the disciples came together' (Acts 20:7). If it is translated temporally as AV and most other versions ('when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them'), then any distinction between meetings appears negated. But an entirely different sense is obtained if the genitive absolute is translated as an attendant circumstance as the NIV and The Jerusalem Bible ('on the first day of the week we came together to break bread. Paul preached to the people'). The 'temporal' translation states Paul formally preached (*dialegomai*) at the Lord's supper; the 'attendant circumstance' translation states Paul formally preached, but not at or during the Lord's supper. Which view is correct?

Several contextual considerations favour the 'attendant circumstance' interpretation. First, Acts 20:6 indicated Paul waited seven days before breaking bread. Why? Instead of breaking bread daily as did the Jerusalem church (Acts 2:46), believers now gathered regularly once a week for the breaking of bread (Acts 20:7). This new historical fact in Acts is primarily one of addition — attendant circumstance.<sup>23</sup> When it is difficult "to discriminate between the temporal participle and that of attendant circumstance or manner,"<sup>24</sup> then the entire context must be studied for the correct determination.

Second, Luke used two different verbs for Paul's preaching (*dialegomai*, Acts 20:7,9) and talking (*homileō*, Acts 20:11). Luke's other contexts of *dialegomai* (Acts 17:2,17; 18:4,19; 19:8-9; 24:12,25) connoted a formal, official type of preaching, reasoning, or lecturing for decision, but *homileō* (Luke 24:14-15; Acts 24:26; and a compound form in Acts 10:27) connoted private, informal conversation. When both occur in close proximity as Acts 24:25-26 and our present passage, the distinctions are especially clear.<sup>25</sup> One would expect official teaching to be more formal than the informal conversation and worship at the communal meal. The different verbs strongly suggest two different types of meetings, each with its own focus.

Third, if the custom was to recline or sit upon or very close to the dining couch while eating, how could Eutychus fall out of a window

while participating in a communal meal? The text could not be clearer that Paul was not preaching at the Lord's supper because that meal was not observed until after Paul went down and embraced Eutychus (Acts 20:10-11).

Therefore, these contextual considerations are ample justification to support the 'attendant circumstance' interpretation of Acts 20:7. While the 'temporal' translation may fit church practice and understanding after the Eucharist was separated from the Agape in the second century, it does not fit the facts of the context in apostolic times. The two different foci of Acts 20:7-12 confirm two different meetings at the same physical location.

### Conclusion

The purpose of studying Paul's Corinthian permission and prohibition concerning women's participation has been to demonstrate that Paul did not contradict himself because he and his audience had two different church meetings with two different foci in mind. Most traditional and egalitarian extremes make the error of believing Paul was speaking of only one church meeting. Paul's Corinthian permission and prohibition are the decisive passages because their distinctive chiasmic contexts make them the longest new testament scripture on the subject of women's church participation. Consequently, they cannot be set aside or ignored. The view that the two chiasmic unities of 1 Cor.11:2-34 and 12:1-14:40 are contrasted to each other by the *peri de* of 12:1 and the view that 11:2-34 is an appendix to 8:1-11:1 allow both Paul's permission and his prohibition to be interpreted with equal weight and authority.

While the distinct chiasmic unities of Paul's permission and prohibition contain many similar concepts such as church(es), congregating, contention, and command, they also demonstrate radical differences in each specific church meeting in relation to each other as in figure 2 below.

Once these differences have been pointed out, I am unable to believe that Paul or his apostolic readers thought that the Lord's supper and the teaching meeting were different aspects of the same church meeting. I do see equal participation of men and women believers at the Lord's supper as a very practical expression of new testament priesthood. This does not mean equal participation at the teaching meeting with Paul's very clear prohibitions on that particular focus (1 Cor.14:34-35; 1 Tim.2:11-15). Harmonising Paul's Corinthian permission with his prohibition should pave the way for a re-examination

Figure 2

## DIFFERENCES IN CHURCH MEETINGS

Aspect	1 Corinthians 11:2-34	1 Corinthians 12-14
A GENERAL:	HEADSHIP, 11:3-16	DIVERSE GIFTS, 12:1-30
B CENTRE SHIFT:	(DIVISIONS, 11:18-19)	(LOVE, 12:31-14:1a)
A' SPECIFIC:	LORD'S SUPPER, 11:20-34	TEACHING MEETING, 14:1b-40
A'1 FOCUS:	<i>Giving to God</i> (teaching is incidental)	<i>Receiving from God</i> (prayer is incidental)
A'2 PARTICIPATION:	No restriction for men or women believers	Restricted to some men only — no women, 14:27-35
A'3 LANGUAGE:	Informal conversation implied	Formal from judgement of audience, 14:29
A'4 SEATING:	No separation of the sexes implied	Separation implied from 14:35 and synagogue practice

and re-evaluation of these very delicate matters. Basic assumptions must be tested.

### Comment

My greatest concern as a unit chaplain has been to minister effectively to as many unit members as possible. A strictly denominational approach by formal preaching does not promote the needed sense of community and concern among unit believers. Many are turning away from artificial or stiff services; they do not appear relevant in today's world. Yet the very simple apostolic type of communion as a separate service from other services during the noon or supper meal has great possibilities for promoting fellowship and community, especially for those in the field, at isolated posts or on board ship.

I have had communion during the Sunday noon meal at my reserve unit. While we ate, the believers encouraged one another by sharing testimonies and general conversation. Those who could not come during our regular morning service could come during the noon meal. It was encouraging to all to have each participate as believer-priests in praise of our Saviour.

Three problems were encountered: (1) the need for the chaplain to teach and encourage the believers as to their believer-priest responsibilities; (2) one hour was not enough time for eating and communion with fellowship; (3) the constant turnover of unit personnel meant starting over again after a short period of time. The combination of the last two problems make an apostolic-type communion service difficult in a reserve component setting, but not in an active component setting.

May this study and practical implementation encourage and stimulate all to minister more effectively.

### NOTES

1. J. Robertson McQuilkin, "Limits of Cultural Interpretation," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23/2 (June 1980) 115.
2. *Ibid.*, p.119.
3. Although favouring current hermeneutical trends, an excellent summary of supporting and contrary arguments for traditional and egalitarian positions is Robert K. Johnston, "The Role of Women in the Church and Home: An Evangelical Test case in Hermeneutics" *Scripture, Tradition, and Interpretation* (ed. W. Ward Gasque and William Sanford LaSor; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 234-259.

4. Chalmer E. Faw, "On the Writing of First Thessalonians," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71 (1952) 221; cf. John C. Hurd, Jr., *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (New York: Seabury Press, 1965) 61-65, 90.
5. cf. Gordon D. Fee, "Eidolothuta Once Again: 1 Corinthians 8-10" *Biblica* 61 (1980) 172-197. This is an outstanding article.
6. E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, reprinted 1968) 364. This work is more objective than *The Companion Bible* published under his editorship; cf. the objective criticism of Nils Wilhelm Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942), 40.
7. William A. Smalley, "Recursion Patterns and Sectioning of Amos," *Technical Papers for The Bible Translator* 30 (1979) 125.
8. Nigel Turner, *Style*, ed. James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (4 vols; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976) IV, 3.
9. William Barclay, *New Testament Words* (London: SCM, 1964) 162.
10. Neither 1 Cor.11:28-31 nor Acts 2:42-43 indicate any known unbeliever participated in the Lord's supper, but unbelievers could attend the teaching meeting (1 Cor.14:23-25); the third condition of 14:23 suggests few outsiders attended. Generally outsiders could attend synagogues or pagan religious gatherings to see and learn, but not participate (C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* [New York: Harper & Row, 1968] 325). However, unbelievers *within* did not escape notice (2 Pet.2:13; Jude 12); perhaps the apostle John added his fuller account of Judas at the last supper to correct unbeliever participation (John 13:18-30). For a contrary view cf. Norman M. Pritchard, "Profession of Faith and Admission to Communion in the Light of 1 Corinthians 11 and Other Passages," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 33 (1980) 55-70.
11. Lund, *Chiasmus*, pp.45-46 cites Isa.28:15-18 as having its conclusion in central rather than at the expected extreme position.
12. On a smaller scale, Estella B. Horning ("Chiasmus, Creedal Structure, and Christology in Hebrews 12:1-2" *Biblical Research* XXIII (1978) 37-48, especially 40-42) demonstrates contextually, syntactically, linguistically, and chiasmically the combining of *dissimilar material* into a single unit of thought following the A B C D E D' C' B' A' pattern.
13. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, p.251.
14. Cf. 1 Cor.7:18-24; Lund, *Chiasmus*, pp.41-44 discusses the very frequent "law of the shift at the centre" to different subject matter in the middle of chiasmatic forms. The extremes are related, but the middle will have a completely different subject.
15. G. G. Findlay, "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians," *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (5 vols; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, reprinted 1961) II, 876.
16. A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (6 vols; Nashville: Broadman, 1931) IV, 159.
17. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957) 281, 618.
18. Joseph Henry Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (cor. ed; New York: American, 1889) 479, 227; G. Abbott-Smith, *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament* (3rd ed; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons 1936) 338, 163.
19. Arndt and Gingrich, *Ibid.* 592-593; Thayer, *Ibid.* 459.
20. Cf. Leonard Whibley (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Studies* (3rd ed; Cambridge: University Press, 1916) 610, 615-16; A. Petrie, *An Introduction to Greek History, Antiquities and Literature* (2nd ed; London: Oxford University Press, 1962) 116;

- J. P. Mahaffy, *Classical Antiquities. I. Old Greek Life*, ed. J. R. Green, History Primers (New York: Appleton, 1881) 27; Ludwig Friedlander, *Roman Life and Manners Under the Early Empire*, trans. Leonard A. Magnus from 7th ed. Sittengeschichte Roms (4 vols; New York: Barnes & Noble, 1968) I, 217, 248; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969) 49; Ludwig Kohler, *Hebrew Man*, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956) 87-91; Max Radin, *The Life of the People in Biblical Times* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1929) 190-93.
21. W. H. Griffith Thomas, "Is the New Testament Minister a Priest?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136 (1979) 65-73. This helpful article was originally published in London as a booklet entitled *Priest or Prophet?*
  22. See examples in Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, pp.634-35.
  23. H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: MacMillan, 1962) 228-29.
  24. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934) 1126-27.
  25. Editor's note: F. F. Bruce comments, "If I wanted to use a Greek word for formal preaching I should use *kērussō* or *katangellō*. Both *diategomai* and *homileō* imply conversation, a two-way process."