A Conversation with the Story of the Lord's Supper in Corinth (1 Cor 11:17-34) 
Engaging the Scripture Text and the Filipino Christians’ Context 

A narrative approach to Sacred Scriptures is not foreign to an Asian context. Documents of the Federation of Asian Bishops Conferences have continuously affirmed the need to promote this indigenous way of interpreting scriptures to complement the Western methods of biblical hermeneutics. In the past three decades, a narrative approach to Paul has been gaining interest in Western scholarship. These two contexts that welcome narrative hermeneutical approaches are a fertile ground for discovering new insights from the stories in the letters of Paul.

To start the narrative conversation, we will make use of the latest reports on the hunger situation in Asia, particularly the Philippines, from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the latest newspaper reports on the hunger situation in the country. We will also converse with the Filipino meal culture through the existing literature and our own experience. As another conversation partner, we will engage the text of the story of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth (1 Cor 11:17-34). We follow the narrative-critical methodology of Norman Petersen in Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul’s Narrative World.1 We will apply this methodology to 1 Cor 11:17-34 and focus on the sociology of the narrative world of 1 Cor 11:17-34. In this paper, we will focus our attention on the plot in the Lord’s Supper narrative, highlight the characters involved, study the point of view of Paul as the letter-sender, and analyze the closural expectations and satisfactions that the text presupposes. Then, we will attempt to have a narrative conversation between the text and the contexts, and vice versa on particular issues such as meals and hospitality, patron-client relationships as well as community conflict and conflict resolution. All of this will have important implications in the context in which we read 1 Cor 11:17-34. The context of this paper is the Filipino Catholic Church as a Church of the Poor faced with hunger.

The Life-Context of Lowland Filipino Christians, my Context as Interpreter and 1 Cor 11:17-34
Daily liturgical celebration of the Eucharist continues to be well attended in the Philippines. But it is also a common sight that at the entrance of the church, throughout the day, some people would be sitting there, begging for food or money. While they are sometimes given food or money by the mass goers, one wonders how Christians who celebrate the Eucharist can effectively respond to the injustice of poverty particularly hunger. This is a snapshot of our life-context in which we seek to read the oldest account of the story of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth in 1 Cor 11:17-34. In this story, Paul critiques the way the Corinthians celebrate the kuriako.n dei/pnon and called it instead i;dion dei/pnon. Paul describes what he finds unacceptable in the Corinthian community meal (vv. 17-22) particularly how it has resulted in some getting hungry and some getting drunk (v. 21bc). He, then, counsels the Corinthians to welcome their hungry brothers and sisters in their midst (v. 34a) by appealing to the foundational story of the meal of the Lord which is at the root of their continue celebration (vv.23-26) and its eschatological consequence (vv. 27-34).

To situate us more exactly, the life-context of our narrative approach to 1 Cor 11:17-34, is the present lowland Filipino Christians’ context. Jose M. de Mesa, a leading Filipino theologian who espouses Filipino theologizing, describes our geographical as well as the socio-cultural-religious context in the vast archipelago of the Philippines:

…the lowland Christian groups- Cebuano, Tagalog, Ilokano, Ilongo, Bikolano, Waray-Waray, Pampango and Pangasinan. These form a socio-cultural entity because they share a common cultural history and a common belief in Roman Catholicism which have reduce their cultural

---

differences to a point where they are more than counter-balanced by cultural similarities. The principal source of cultural differentiation among them is language rather than race, religion, or social and economic organization. Nine out of every ten Filipinos are Christians, most of whom are Catholics, and live on lowland coasts and in valleys. Although they exhibit some differences in diet, dress, and custom, the lowland Christians, as they are collectively known, are remarkably homogenous in culture and society and have had a long history of harmonious interrelations.²

Our particular lowland Filipino Christian context will include three interrelated aspects: the specific challenge of gutom (hunger) besetting our country today, our deeply-rooted salu-salo (or kainan, meal-orientedness) and our fondness for kwentuhan (story-telling and conversation). Our fondness for story-telling is hoped to help us in our hermeneutical task where there is a growing need for inculturated approaches. In this respect, we believe that a narrative approach may be more sensitive to the indigenous approaches of interpretation. Moreover, it relates to the interesting use of the farewell meal story of the Lord which Paul appeals to in correcting the Corinthians (1 Cor 11:23-26). Our deeply-rooted meal-orientedness can serve as the prism in which we can view and engage the story of the Lord’s Supper and the abuses in Corinth which Paul censures in vv. 17-34. The concrete challenge of hunger in the country today beckons lowland Filipino Christians who continue to tell and celebrate the Lord’s Supper to responsively respond to this injustice as we endeavour to become the Church of the Poor.³

While these aspects of the lowland Filipino Christians’ context remain a constant background and horizon for my option to converse⁴ with the biblical text, my own personal context makes engaging the Bible contextually even more complicated. I am a lowland Filipina Christian myself who has taught biblical classes for three years in seminaries and formation houses in Metro Manila. The reality of people begging for food, especially street children and street families, was a constant challenge in the vicinity of the places where I worked and lived and where Eucharistic celebration is part of daily life. I have been influenced in my study of the Bible by brilliant mentors who were also passionate with social justice. Some are Filipinos who received their doctorate from European universities while some are European and American missionaries who have been in the Philippines even before I was born. Now, I am a doctoral student in Biblical Exegesis in the Catholic University of Louvain in Belgium, learning western biblical methodologies but always desiring to make my scriptural and theological training relevant to the present day Filipino context that has shaped me and continues to be one of my foremost concerns. While I am aware that there is a debate concerning who can do Asian contextualized theologizing, how it should be done, and where it ought to be discerned and articulated, I believe that Western-schooled Asian scholars
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² For a discussion on lowland Filipinos, see Jose M. de Mesa, “Providence as God’s Children for his People in the Lowland Filipino Context: An Attempt at Theological Re-rooting of a Gospel Theme” PhD. Dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1978, xiii-xiv. He also uses the same description of lowland Filipinos in his follow up work, And God Said, “Bahala na!”: The Theme of Providence in the Lowland Filipino Context Maryhill Studies 2 (Jose M. de Mesa, 1979), Foreword. Our attempt to specifically mention the lowland Filipino context is meant to respect the meal practices of other Filipinos who live in the mountains and the seas or smaller islands of the archipelago.

³ This is the vision of church set forth in the Second Plenary Council of the Philippines, Acts and Decrees of the Second Plenary Council of the Philippines (Pasay City: Paulines Publishing House, 1992), nos. 122-136. This is also one of the visions for the church in Asia, see Final Statement and Recommendations of the Fifth Bishops’ Institute for Social Action held in Baguio City, Philippines on 21 May to 1 June 1979 in Gaudencio B. Rosales and C. G. Arevalo, eds. For All the Peoples of Asia: Federation of Asian Bishops’ Conferences Documents from 1970 to 1991 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis and Quezon City: Claretian Publications, 1992), 217-221 specifically p.219. Likewise, see Arnel Lagarejos, The Church of the Poor. A Moral-Theological Investigation of its Development and Incidence on the Relations Between Church and State. Excerpta ex Dissertate ad Doctoratum in Facultae Theologie PontificæUniversitatis Gregorianæ (Rome, 1998).

⁴ In the lowland Filipino context, “kwentuhan” can both mean conversation and story-telling and conversation itself can include a lot of story-telling.
have a particular contribution in this worthy endeavour. In this paper we will follow the example of Norman R. Petersen’s narrative analysis of a Pauline letter, but limit ourselves to a study of the characters in 1 Cor 11:17-34. Yet I will also go beyond it because of my contextual concerns that include narrative hermeneutics which is indigenous to Asia and the Philippines, the Filipino meal culture that I continue to have and encounter even outside the Philippines and the challenge of hunger the beset my people, and a million others, even now.

A Closer Look at the Lowland Filipino Christian Context and the Story of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth

As we mentioned in our introduction, there are three aspects of lowland Filipino contexts that will serve as conversation partner of our interpretation of 1 Cor 11:17-34. These aspects include the hunger situation that beset many Filipinos, the meal culture of the lowland Filipino Christians, and the Filipinos’ penchant for story-telling. These three aspects engage the story of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth in line with the text’s context of famine and the issue of hunger in the Corinthian setting, the abuses at the communal table-fellowship, and the importance of story-telling in correcting the faulty celebration. We will discuss each one of them below.

1. Hunger in the Philippines and Hunger in 1 Cor 11:21bc

The first aspect of the current Filipino context that needs to be considered in view of our dialogue with the story of the Lord’s Supper in 1 Cor 11:17-34, particularly vv.21bc, 33-34a, is the problem of hunger besetting the country today. We recognize that the issue of hunger, its cause, effect and possible solution, is complicated.5 I have also spoken about my face to face encounter with hungry people especially those who constantly beg at the door of the churches and those who knock at convent doors. When seen in the larger perspective the picture is even more disturbing. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the one billion mark of people suffering hunger has been reached as the economic situation worldwide has worsened.6 Twenty-five countries in Asia, including the Philippines, are considered Low-Income Food Deficit Countries by the FAO7 and according to the 2009 Millennium Development Goals report cites that 21% of the population in Southern Asia in 2008 is undernourished.8 The current situation in our country presents an impoverished nation with a good number of its almost 92 million people9 suffering hunger everyday. The recent survey of the Social Weather Station (SWS) in the Philippines reports the following:

The June 2009 survey also found that 39% of Filipino families (est. 7.2 million) consider themselves as Food-Poor, 33% put themselves on the Food-Borderline, and 28% consider themselves as Not Food-Poor. Self-Rated Food Poverty has been volatile at 49% in June 2008,

5 We cannot pinpoint just one cause of hunger or only one way to solve this problem. Modern hunger situation is related to poverty, land rights and ownership, diversion of land use to non-productive use, increasing emphasis on export-oriented agriculture, inefficient agricultural practices, war, famine, drought, over-fishing, poor crop yield, lack of democracy and rights and many others. See the relevant materials available from http://www.globalissues.org/article/7/causes-of-hunger-are-related-to-poverty, http://www.worldhunger.org/articles/Learn/world%20hunger%20facts%202002.htm and http://www.wfp.org/hunger/causes (accessed 28 September 2009).

6 This recent development is one of the important background and agenda of the coming World Summit on Food Security in Rome on 16-18 November, 2009 in Rome. For more details see http://www.fao.org/wsfs/world-summit/en/ (accessed 19 September 2009).


9 The projected Philippine population in 2009 is 92.23 million according to the National Statistics Office available from http://www.census.gov.ph/ (17 September 2009).
In a related report, the SWS made known that in the second quarter of 2009, overall hunger in the country rose to 5%. The change is particularly due to the increase of people experiencing “moderate hunger” which includes Filipinos experiencing involuntary hunger “only once” or “a few times.” The increase in the last three months involves an estimated 2.0 million Filipino families (11.1%) to about 2.9 million families (16%) and is 7 points above the average of those experiencing “Moderate Hunger” in the last ten years. The report concerning those who experience “Severe Hunger,” i.e. those who experience hunger "Often" or "Always" in the last three months, declined a bit from 4.4% (about 810,000 families) in the month of February to 4.3% (estimated 790,000 families) in June of this year. In comparison to the past ten years, this result is only just a point above the average “Severe Hunger” rate of 3.4%. Since June 2004, surveys on hunger in the country have been in double-digits consistently. The mere fact that hunger surveys and hunger reports are nuanced already indicates the severity of the problem.

2. Filipino Meal–Orientedness (Pagsasalu-salo) and 1 Cor 11:17-34
One wonders how this above-mentioned challenge of hunger can be responded to individually and communally in a nation where daily and Sunday Eucharistic celebrations remain very well attended and that has a deeply rooted meal culture. While the issue of hunger and proposed solution to it are highly complex, in this present study we would like to examine how a more conscious remembering of the kuriako.n deipnon augmented by sensitivity to the Filipino meal culture (pagsasalu-salo) particularly the value of hating-kapatid can be potentially effective. Both of these factors can make lowland Filipino Christians today realize their common identity as people and as Christians for an attitude that could lead to a reconsideration of how our culture and faith celebration embodied in the Eucharist can potentially enhance diverse effective communal response to the issue of hunger. This insight finds expression in the Filipinos’ popular but inadequately unarticulated Christological image of Jesus Christ at table.

Our lowland Filipino food culture is best summarized by one of the most common greeting: “Kain tayo!” or “Salo na!” (“Come, let us eat!”). This greeting is usually spoken by someone who has food or someone who has prepared the food to those surrounding him or her, whether they are friends or strangers and can result in food sharing and story-telling. This practice points to our food and narrative culture.

We Filipinos are meal-oriented (salu-salo, kainan). Because Filipinos consider almost everyone as part of their family (parang pamilya), we are known for being gracious hosts and grateful guests. Serving our guest with the best we have is an inborn value to Filipinos, rich and poor alike. We love to celebrate any and all events with a special meal. Even with unexpected guests,

---

12 Ibid.
13 One of the most common expressions is the presence of a depiction of the Last Supper in Filipino dining rooms. While most of the images still bear the European model, local representations are multiplying. See also José M. de Mesa and Lode Wostyn, Doing Christology: The Reappropriation of a Tradition (Quezon City: Claretians, 1989), 128-133 and José M. de Mesa, “Ang Eukaristiya: Bagong Ugnayan” in Solidarity with Culture: Studies in Theological Re-rooting. Maryhill Studies 4 (Quezon City), 200-223 for a related Filipino reading of Jesus’ table fellowship and the Eucharist.
we Filipinos try our best to offer something, meager as it may be, with the traditional greeting: ‘Come and eat with us’ (Tuloy po kayo at kumain muna tayo).  

Without being exhaustive of the meaning of table-fellowship and the relationships of table-fellows in the Filipino setting, it has been observed that one can guess the degree of relationship among partakers of meals in the lowland Filipino setting by the way people treat each other. This ranges from ibang tao (outsider category) to hindi ibang tao (insider category). Carmen Santiago made a study on the language of food sharing in a middle class town of Bulacan that reflects this view and can help enlighten this custom. While the study was written thirty-three years ago, the practice is still mostly the same. Filipino hospitality expressed in table-fellowship continues to follow the movement that we will describe below. Likewise, while the study was also done with the middle class as main subject, the graciousness of the Filipino as host and gratefulness as guest is not limited to those who can afford. Even among the poor, there is a parallel gracious hospitality even with the material limitations. Filipinos’ meal-orientedness expresses their meaning in life.

The Filipino map of personal hierarchy is part of the interpersonal relations that govern the way we deal with our fellow human beings. The goal of this is pakikipagkapwa (humanness at its highest level, shared inner identity). In pakikipagkapwa, one arrives at the level where the kapwa (other) is sarili na rin (oneself). The concept of the shared inner self is the basis of the concept of kapwa and not just smooth interpersonal relationships. For this reason, it is more concerned with the recognition of shared identity, an inner self that is shared with others and thus it is the only concept that embraces both the categories of

---

15 See also Brazal, “Reinventing Pakikipagkapwa,” 56: “According to Enriquez, this does not mean that the Filipino does not distinguish between the ‘in-group’ and the ‘out-group’, the ‘member’ or the ‘non-member,’ as other ethnic groups do. It just seems that the Filipino is more flexible in drawing the lines. We do have a concept of the ibang tao- the stranger, the foreigner, the person of another religion or culture. But it would seem that the ‘other’ is not really treated as a ‘totally other’ or ‘in opposition to the self.’”
16 See Carmen Santiago, “The Language of Food”, in The Culinary Culture of the Philippines (Manila: Bancom Audiovision Corporation, 1976), 133-139. This is still generally the case in the rural areas, other factors are slowly effecting some changes. These changes are most obvious in the urban setting where eating out in fast foods and restaurants is becoming more common in cementing relationships through meals. Migration also has its effect as Filipinos become exposed to the food culture of other nations. See for example the essay of Nota F. Magno, “Filipino Food Ways in Japan: A case of Filipino Migrant Women Married to Japanese Men in Tokyo” Philippine Sociological Review Vol.48 (January- December 2000): 52-71.
17 Virgilio Enriquez, “Kapwa and the Struggle for Justice, Freedom and Dignity” Pamamaraan: Indigenous Knowledge and Evolving Research Paradigms Teresita Obusan and Angelina Rodriguez, eds. (Quezon City: Asian Center, 1994), 1-18, here 3. See also Katrin de Guia, Kapwa: The Self in the Other: Worldviews and Lifestyles of Filipino Culture Bearers (Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, 2005). On p. 27 she follows the description that is the core value of the Filipinos, taking it from the “Value System of Philippine Psychology” in Virgilio Enriquez, From Colonial to Liberation Psychology (Quezon City: UP Press, 1992), 75. On pp.8-9 de Guia explains that kapwa is not limited to human persons but also includes nature. See also Agnes M. Brazal, “Reinventing Pakikipagkapwa: An Exploration of its potential for Promoting Respect for Plurality and Difference” in Fundamentalism and Pluralism in the Church, ed. Dennis T. Gonzalez (Manila: DAKATEO, 2004), 50-70, especially 66-67 where she mentions examples of food-sharing among non-lowland Filipinos. She mentions the Ibaloi well-off villagers who supply the food and drink during harvest feast; a group of Western Manobos’ concept of upakat (“in times of crisis, they have mutual sharing of food, work and support”); and a practice among Agta hunters to share the biggest part of the animal that they have hunted to the weakest members of their group, namely, the young and the old. Semblances of these are also present in the lowland Filipino Christian context. Hence, we believe that while there is a great possibility that there could be similarities in meal cultures among Filipinos, our lack of concrete experience with them and the paucity of materials we have at hand prevents us from making a generalized claim on the non-lowland Filipinos and their meal practices.
outsiders (ibang tao) and the insiders (hindi ibang tao).\(^{19}\) In this study we will examine how these levels of relationship are reflected in Filipino Pagsasalu-salo.

According to Santiago, the interpersonal relationship which is noticeable in table fellowship can be divided into two categories concerning interpersonal relationships: ibang tao (Outsider Category) and hindi ibang tao (Insider Category). Examining Table 1: Levels of Relationships in a Filipino Pagsasalu-salo (please see attachment), we see that the ibang tao Category has three levels: pakikitungo (level of amenities), pakikibagay (level of conforming) and pakikisama (level of adjusting). The hindi ibang tao category consists of two levels: pakikipagpalagayang-loob (level of mutual trust) and pakikiisa (level of fusion, unity and full trust). If we consult Table 1, we see that these levels build upon each other. The progression of relationship between table mates is evident in the quality of relationships expressed in the meals, the kind of food prepared, and even the utensils used. What is most relevant in our discussion is the movement of relationship among partakers from pakkitungo (which depicts the widest interpersonal distance among table fellows most obviously) to pakikiisa (which shows the closest manifestation of unity and full trust among partakers). The level of pakikiisa (level of fusion, unity and full trust) is the level where there is deepest level of interpersonal relationship that recognizes the shared inner identity. The participants consist of people who are very familiar with each other which include extended family members and very close friends. There is no social distance or distinction and there is mutual identification and oneness. In our Filipino meal setting, this means that one can share everyday food, no matter how much one has, and meal participants can dispense with utensils and use one’s hands in eating. The one previously regarded as “not-one-of-us” gradually moves from being a guest towards becoming a host and then, finally, even becoming a co-servant at table when the deepest level of solidarity in relationship has been achieved.

Within this complex development of interpersonal relationship from ibang-tao (Outsider Category) to hindi-ibang-tao (Insider Category) distinctively shown in table-fellowship, a particular value, called hating-kapatid, can be discerned in the insider category, in the level of both pakikipagpalagayang-loob and pakikiisa (last two columns to the right of Table 1) that is particular among siblings. Hating-kapatid is literally translated as “divide among siblings,” and its nonliteral translation retains this idea, “to divide or allocate equally.”\(^{20}\) It is a compound word composed of hati (division, partition) and kapatid (brother, sister) with kapatid modifying hati and resulting in a “kind or quality of partitioning or sharing of goods expected among brothers and sisters.”\(^{21}\) Hating-kapatid connotes equal sharing. This is carried out in at different ways. The most basic is to divide the food in equal portion. Sometimes, “[t]his term refers to the act of one dividing and the other having first choice regarding the preferred portion. Variations include behaviors whereby one forgoes his or her share in favour of who ever needs it more.”\(^{22}\) This concept is usually appealed to when there is not enough food to go around and an equal sharing, no matter how meagre, is advocated to make sure everyone receives an equal portion.\(^{23}\) In the same way, this is invoked in instances of unjust division when participants in the pakikiisa level forget being a kapwa to their tablefellows and gets more for oneself without thinking about the others (lamang). This is also true in cases of
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\(^{19}\) Enriquez, “Kapwa and the Struggle for Justice, Freedom and Dignity,” 3.


\(^{23}\) Hating-kapatid can also be invoked involving other non-food goods or properties to be shared but it is mostly used in food and meal context.
absence. Those who are present must think of the absent one in dividing the food and set aside this person’s share (tira), and not only to satisfy their needs and gather what is left-over (tira-tira). The one who reminds those involve in the act of division and advocates for this kind of sharing can be the parents or the siblings themselves, or in the case of good friends, anyone among them. When this concept is appealed to, everyone is reminded to think not only of themselves but to remember the most basic principle of having equal share. From this basic premise one can also go beyond and be more generous. Hating-kapatid is apparent (and mutually expected) in the relationship of blood-siblings as well as by people who have come to regard each other as siblings.

The value of hating-kapatid at meals in the pakikiisa level, then, can be an important prism in which to view the story of the Lord’s Supper in 1 Cor 11:17-34 and to characterize the actors in the story particularly in vv. 23-26, 33-34a. To do this, we are hoping that a narrative approach, which is indigenous to the continent and is very common as well in the Philippines, can enlighten our contextual reading of the Lord’s Supper story in Corinith.

3. Kwentuhan (Story-telling) and 1 Cor 11:17-34
In the Philippines, as in other parts of Asia, story-telling is very common as a means of interpersonal communication, remembering personal and communal stories, and handing on of traditions. It is very probable that when asking logical and analytical questions about the people’s faith and beliefs, one can get a story for an answer. 24 “Where the kwento [story] is still being told, it continues to possess the power of bringing people together. For the kwento in its disarming simplicity is replete with the symbols and values of the race which resonates with the people whenever it is told.”25

The sharing of stories permeates many facets of our life. Religious traditions, particularly biblical stories, can be expressed narratively in many ways with a particular fondness for characterization. For example, role-playing is used in retelling (a conflation of) the infancy narratives and the passion narratives. The panunuluyan is a popular way of enacting the search for a dwelling of Mary and Joseph when Jesus was about to be born. The habasa or pasyon,26 a chanted, non-stop recitation of Jesus’ passion and death from all the four gospels set in poetic verse as well as the senakulo, a passion play in the vernacular, are common in the country during the Holy Week. Bibliodrama has also gained popularity.27 In liturgical celebrations and in occasions of bible-sharing in the Basic Ecclesial Communities (BECs), story-telling is

25 Ibid., 97-98.
27 Bibliodrama has been popularized in the Philippines by the team of Ms. Joy Candelario and Rudy Pöhl according to Arturo M. Bastes, “The Present Trends of the Biblical Apostolate” The ICST Journal 7 (2005): 16-31. On p. 28, he explains: “This trend is very acceptable to us Filipinos and Asians because of the element of DRAMA, a word that conotes [sic] action or role-play. The biblical approach is appealing because of the element of playful involvement in biblical texts in order to bring our experiences, our life perspective and context into relationship with the message of the bible. As in other approaches bibliodrama through playing out of biblical stories reveals the close connection between the Word of God and one’s own life.” See also Rudolph Pöhl, “Dei Verbum Meets Homo Ludens: Bibliodrama in South-East Asia,” translated by Martin Jäggi BMS and Julian Lock, The Way (2008): 63-75.
also expressed by participants who identify with biblical characters as well as with biblical situations. Liturgical sharing or homilies are also given using folk stories or current events and expounding on the characters involved to serve as a jumping board for a fuller theological exploration.

Apart from the oral or enacted narrative biblical interpretations from the grassroots, a vast collection of written works, by Asians and in Asia, is also growing in the biblical academy. Some of these efforts can be considered as part of the indigenization of biblical interpretations in what has come to be regarded as nativism and vernacular hermeneutics.\(^{28}\) Several ways of narrative biblical interpretation have been done and continue to be done by Asian scholars, both exegetes and non-exegetes, Protestants and Catholics alike.\(^{29}\) Some of these ways make use of Asian folk stories and from it gather biblical insights.\(^{30}\) Others start with the scriptural stories and afterwards relate them to Asian narratives, folk tales and/or current events.\(^{31}\) There are also attempts that weave their biblical theologizing in a story format.\(^{32}\) Some works of Asian exegetes can also use narrative criticism without mentioning the particularity of their Asian geographical location.\(^{33}\) Still others show how specific biblical texts impact their own personal story as an Asian whether they are in Asia or not.\(^{34}\) Likewise, there are other works of narrative scholars, especially exegetes, who interpret the biblical texts using narrative criticism, with special attention to the characters


\(^{29}\) In this paper we wish to highlight the contribution of Filipino scholars and we do not mean to give an exhaustive list of Asian biblical scholars who attempt to do narrative biblical readings.


\(^{32}\) One of the best example of this approach is found in Carlos Abesamis, *Backpack of A Jesus-Seeker: ... Following in the Footsteps of the Original Jesus*, available from [http://www.lst.edu/prof/cabesamis/backpack%201.htm](http://www.lst.edu/prof/cabesamis/backpack%201.htm) (accessed 01 April 2009). Another form of story-telling is seen in the example of Nirmala Suresh’ Yesu Maakavyam or “The Greatest Epic on Jesus” described in A. Anthony Cruz, “Jesus Christ in Tamil Epic Literature” *Jeeradhara* XXXVIII (2008): 260-270.


involved, vis-à-vis a particular concern in view of Asia’s cultures, religions and its many people who live in poverty.35

It is important that there is an explicit recognition of the many ways of narrative interpretation of the Bible in Asia particularly in the Philippine setting. While most of these are carried out in the practical level, there is also a need to articulate that narrative biblical interpretation is an indigenous method that needs to be fostered in the continent so that it contributes to the building up of Asian theologies particularly in the Philippines.36 Asian theologians, whether in the continent or not, advocate conscious efforts to develop and utilize these indigenous manners in theologizing, in actualizing the biblical message, and in articulating Asian theologies.37 The Federation of Asian Bishops’ Conferences supports this initiative and has articulated in some of its documents and workshops the need to continuously harness narrative approaches in biblical interpretation.38 This has been endorsed by the Synod of Bishops for Asia in 199839 which has been echoed in the post-synodal Vatican document40 and reaffirmed by subsequent official and continent-wide reflections in Asia.41 It is from this perspective that we believe contributing to a narrative biblical interpretation in the Philippines will be a worthy endeavour.


39 See also Synod of Bishops, “Jesus Christ the Saviour and His Mission of Love and Service in Asia:”...That They May Have Life, and Have It Abundantly” (Jn 10:10). Instrumentum Laboris No. 27” which states “... one of many ways of doing this, in a particularly Asiatic manner, would be through the use of stories and parables coming from the Bible,” available from http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/synod/documents/rc_synod_doc_20021998_asia-instrlabor_en.html (accessed 15 April 2009).

40 John Paul II, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation: Ecclesia in Asia, No. 20 available from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp_ii_exh_06111999_ecclesia-in-asia_en.html (accessed 15 April 2009): “In general, narrative methods akin to Asian cultural forms are to be preferred. In fact, the proclamation of Jesus Christ can most effectively be made by narrating his story, as the Gospels do”.

41 See FABC Papers, No. 95, “A Renewed Church in Asia: Pastoral Directions for a New Decade. A Pastoral Report of Seventh Plenary Assembly, Samphran, Thailand. January 2000,” under the section “A Pastoral Vision for This
These developments coincide with the flourishing of narrative criticism in academic circles. While it has been obviously helpful in interpreting the stories in the Bible (e.g., Torah, Gospels, Acts), the New Testament letters, particularly those of Paul are now also studied in this light. This parallel growth in the practice and appreciation of narrative biblical interpretation influenced our present option in engaging the story of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth using Norman R. Petersen’s method in his above mentioned book Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul’s Narrative World. More specifically, though, we find it interesting to explore Paul’s appeal to the story of the Lord’s farewell meal in 1 Cor 11:23-26 in correcting the problems in Corinth.

This openness to narrative approaches in biblical interpretation, particularly the focus on characterization, is enhanced even more in our life-context by the very deep influence of meal-sharing in our culture. The rich mixture of story-telling and table-fellowship is a significant part of the religious, cultural and social setting of the Filipinos particularly lowland Filipino Christian and their kapwa-centeredness. From this perspective, we believe that using a narrative approach which is sensitive to characterization can facilitate our contextual study of 1 Cor 11:17-34 from the lens of lowland Filipino meal culture which can, in turn, help in harnessing values that aids in responding to the issue of hunger.

The main issue, then, where the three aspects of our life-context converge and can have a conversation with the story that we find in 1 Cor 11:17-34 is found in Paul’s characterization of the main actors in this episode which include both the actors (Corinthians, the Lord, and himself) as well as the non-human characters (the kuriako.n dei/ponon and idion dei/ponon) How does Paul link hunger and the kuriako.n dei/ponon (vv. 17-22)? How does he use the foundational story of the Lord’s farewell meal in vv. 23-26, and the command for a concrete change in the meal

Decade: Recommendations of the Workshops of the Plenary Assembly: A Synopsis” available from http://www.ucanews.com/html/fabc-papers/fabc-95.htm (accessed 23 July 2008) where the participants of the FABC workshops declared: “The Asian image of Jesus demands a shift in our pedagogy. The evocative pedagogy used by the (Asian) Jesus should be preferred to the doctrinal and abstract. Stories, images, symbols, parables, myths, chanting of sacred texts etc., should become the primary medium, as is emphasized in Ecclesia in Asia (20), with a clear focus on the experience of life and of God. In this connection, the story of Jesus and the image etched in those stories should get priority. Then, Jesus’ God-centered (or Abba-centered) and kingdom-centered life and ministry will become attractive to the Asian heart, in which the inner-religious and the socio-cultural dialogue will better converge.” Likewise, see The Message of the First Asian Mission Congress, “Telling the Story of Jesus in Asia” East Asian Pastoral Review 44/3 (2007) available from http://eapi.admu.edu.ph/ea/pr007/ea/pr007.htm (accessed 17 September 2009).

conduct to let the Corinthians change their ways (v.34a)? In what way does Paul characterize the actors in this episode that leads to the expected closure when the Corinthians receive the letter? What will be the content of the conversation of this episode with the life-context of lowland Filipino Christians who face the challenge of hunger in view of these two questions? We will try to answer these questions by considering the point of view of this passage, the plot of the story discernible in Paul’s way of telling the story, and the most of all in his characterization of the main actors in this episode.

**Narrative Context of 1 Cor 11:17-34**

The canonical 1 Corinthians is Paul’s multi-faceted approach through epistolary presence to the many problems the Corinthians posed to him as well as those reported to him. While the Corinthians did not mention in their letter to Paul any problem with their celebration of the Lord’s Supper, Paul heard disturbing news that made him deal with it in 1 Cor 11:17-34. Paul already mentioned related aspect of the Lord’s Supper in view of idol worship in 1 Corinthians 10 but there are abuses at the Lord’s Supper when the Corinthian Christians gather that Paul cannot allow to continue and deserve additional attention.

The episode of the faulty celebration of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth in 1 Cor 11:17-34 can be clearly delimited from its surrounding context in view of the letter’s poetic sequence. The preceding verses, vv. 2-16, talk about Paul commending the Corinthians for remembering him and maintaining the traditions that he delivered to them. Moreover, the topic concerns women and their veil during liturgical assemblies. The words of Paul in v. 16 are definitive in closing this topic. In 12:1-11, we recognize a new topic concerning spiritual gifts. This is signalled by Paul’s use of an introductory formula, \( \text{πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλήσιαν τῆς Κορινθίων.} \) (see also 7:1, 25; 8:1; and 16:1, 12). In addition to the clear delineation of the topics that precedes and comes after 1 Cor 11:17-34, the story of itself of what seems as abuses at the Lord’s Supper, the story of the Lord’s Supper itself, and how Paul proposes to correct the failure at the communal gathering as content of vv.17-34 result in the pericope being easily delimited as one episode.

1. Paul’s Point of View in Telling the Plot of the Story of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth

As we embark on our narrative study of 1 Cor 11:17-34, we remember that we learn of the story from the point of view of Paul. Petersen expounds that point of view is the position a narrator takes as s/he talks to someone in relation to the actors whose actions are being described. In the case of Paul’s letters, the point of view is governed by Paul who is both the letter-writer and the narrator. As Petersen remarked, “Each story is governed by Paul’s point of view, because all we know of each is learned from him, even

---

44 See Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 48 who explains that the poetic sequence (PS) is the way the emplotted events appear in the text itself. Paul already discussed some aspect of the communal celebration earlier in the letter in 1 Cor 10:16-22.


46 Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 11. While we can also explore the temporal, spatial, psychological, phraseological planes of point of view, our current focus on ideological plane help us in the task of characterization. For a more thorough explanation, see Gary Yamasaki, *Watching a Biblical Narrative: Point of View in Biblical Exegesis* (New York/London: T & T Clark, 2008), 153-187.
the point of view of characters in his stories, who are sometimes allowed by him as narrator to voice their own points of view, but more often have points of view attributed to them by him.” 47

In 1 Cor 11:17-34 we are made very much aware of the ideological plane of point of view of Paul both as (1) the letter-writer who narrates to the Corinthians how he considers their celebration of the Lord’s Supper as faulty, and (2) as a character in his own letter who hopes to initiate change in the Corinthian situation. The Corinthians’ point of view is represented by Paul (vv.18cd, 22bc) and yet overshadowed by his own perspective as given from the beginning of the narration (v.17), the inclusio in v.22ef, and the majority of the verbs in the first person singular.

2. The Plot of the Story of the Lord’s Supper in 1 Cor 11:17-34
Paul’s point of view influences his telling of the story as we have it in 1 Cor 11:17-34. Paul tells us the plot from his own perspective. From the commendation in v. 16 a shift to a negative comment from Paul is introduced in v. 17. From here, we are already made aware that the Corinthians and their celebration are seen in a negative light. Paul’s double non-commendation in vv. 17b and 22ef (ouvk evpainw/) influences the whole telling of this episode particularly how he opted to speak of the present problem in Corinth (vv. 17-22), then goes back to the past and appeals to the story of the kuriako.n dei/pnon vv. 23-26) and brings in the future aspect with his discussion of the theme of judgment in relation to the faulty common meal in Corinth (vv. 27-32) and the changes that he wants them to carry out (vv. 33-34a). In providing an alternative, Paul implicitly and explicitly presents a comparison and contrast of the idion dei/pnon (vv. 18-22) and the ideal kuriako.n dei/pnon (vv. 23-26). Paul also gives us insights on the eschatological implications of unworthy eating of the bread and drinking of the cup particularly in light of the judgment theme (vv. 27-32), how the Corinthians can change their conduct and correct their failure (33-34a), and Paul’s coming to deal with the other things when he comes (v.34b).

With this broad stroke of the plot of the story of the Lord’s Supper in the background, we now expound on Paul’s ideological point of view as we pay a closer look at how he implicitly and explicitly describes the characters in this passage and allow them to dialogue with our lowland Filipino Christian context.

The Characters of the Story of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth and the Lowland Filipino Christian Context: A Three-fold Conversation

Our conversation with the story of the Lord’s Supper will particularly deal with the non-human characters and human characters in this episode. In our discussion of these characters, we will consider three points: (1) the significance of meals and hospitality in line with our discussion of the kuriako.n dei/pnon and the idion dei/pnon vis-à-vis the lowland Filipino’s pagsasalo; (2) the possible presence of patron-client relationship among the human-actors (Corinthian Christians and Paul) vis-à-vis pagsasalo in the pakikiisa level; and (3) the challenge of community conflict and its resolution and Paul’s attempts to rectify the Corinthian abuses vis-à-vis the role of hating-kapatid in conflict resolution.

47 Petersen, Rediscovering Paul, 15: “Each story is governed by Paul’s point of view, because all we know of each is learned from him, even the point of view of characters in his stories, who are sometimes allowed by him as narrator to voice their own points of view, but more often have points of view attributed to them by him.”
48 See Yamasaki, Watching a Biblical Narrative, 173-182. On p. 174, he explains that “the narrator’s ideological point of view functions to orient the audience’s evaluation of everything in the story.” One of the ways in which the narrator’s can express this is by way of establishing a “reliable” character which serves as a reliable source of the narrator’s viewpoint (p.175). Paul’s ideological point of view is expressed in 1 Cor 11:17-34 by means of his characterization of the actors in this passage particularly the non-human character kuriako.n dei/pnon.
1. Meals and Hospitality: The ιδιόν deι/πνον, the κυριακόν deι/πνον and Filipino Pagsasalu-salo

The main problem in 1 Cor 11:17-34 is found in the difference between the tradition of the foundational story of the κυριακόν deι/πνον (vv. 23-25) which Paul handed on to the Corinthians and the way it is currently celebrated which does not represent the story (vv. 18-22), making Paul call it by another name, ιδιόν deι/πνον. A tabular presentation can facilitate our characterization of the two suppers. From Paul’s letter we note that he explicitly and implicitly describes these two non-human characters which are the main subjects of the problem in Corinth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corinthians’ Own (Lord’s) Supper</th>
<th>Paul’s Ideal Lord’s Supper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ιδιόν deι/πνον</td>
<td>κυριακόν deι/πνον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>there are divisions and factions</strong> (1 Cor 11:18-19)</td>
<td><em>there should be no division nor faction; communal unity should be present</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>based on Lord’s Supper as Paul taught them but mixed with the Corinthians own customs</strong></td>
<td>based on the tradition/foundational story traceable from the Lord on the night he was betrayed (1 Cor 11:23-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>does not fit the way Jesus meant the Lord’s Supper to be</strong></td>
<td>the breaking of the bread and the sharing of the cup as the Lord’s own self-giving of his body and blood “for you” (1 Cor 11:23-25 especially 24c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>not a remembrance of the Lord nor a proclamation of his death until he comes</strong></td>
<td>done in remembrance of the Lord (1 Cor 11:24d, 25d) and it is a proclamation of the Lord’s death until he comes (1 Cor 11:26).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>diners do not examine themselves</strong></td>
<td>partakers of this supper must do so in a worthy manner for they are answerable for the body of the Lord (1 Cor 11:27), they have to examine themselves lest they incur judgment (1 Cor 11:28-34c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way the Corinthians celebrate it results in weakness and illness and death (1 Cor 11:30).</td>
<td>When done properly does not seem to result in weakness, illness and death among them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diners do not wait for each other (1 Cor 11:21a)</td>
<td>partakers wait for each other/welcome each other as brothers and sisters when they come together to eat in the house (1 Cor 11:33c, 34b, see also 22a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is unequal food and drink distribution (1 Cor 11:21bc)</td>
<td>equal food and drink distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can be construed as a contempt for the church of God (1 Cor 11:22b)</td>
<td>acceptance of and respect for the church of God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49 Petersen did not need to deal with non-human characters in his study of the letter to Philemon and, therefore, has a more limited since he focused only on the relationships among human actors. In line with 1 Cor 11:17-34, we deem it important to acknowledge that and characterize the κυριακόν deι/πνον and the ιδιόν deι/πνον as non-human characters in our narrative-critical approach.

50 Implied characterization is in italics to differentiate it from the emplotted description. This is one of the important contributions of Petersen in his discussion of the roles of the characters in a letter which we adopt here for the non-human characters under discussion.
results in a humiliation of those who have not (1 Cor 11:22c).

results in respect and inclusion of ‘those who have not’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-commendable celebration (1 Cor 11:17b, 22def)</th>
<th>Commendable celebration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This comparison above highlights how, in Paul’s point of view, the iōdion dei/pnon is incompatible with the kuriako.n dei/pnon. Paul refreshes the Corinthians’ memory and appeals to the story of Jesus’ farewell meal in service of correcting what is wrong in the community so that unity will be fostered and nobody should be hungry.⁵¹

It seems to me that Paul’s characterization of the Lord’s Supper as pertaining to the Lord, through the implied⁵² and implicit descriptions, is important in at least two ways: first, it asks us to probe what could have been the context in the narrative world that gave rise to this censure and correction; and, second, it gives us clues why Paul finds it scandalizing the some are hungry in the common gathering in relation to their common symbolic universe.

a. Some Features of the Narrative World Reflected in 1 Cor 11:17-34

From the text of 1 Cor 11:17-34 one can surmise that the church in Corinth has opportunities to gather as a community (sune,rcomai)⁵³ in vv. 17c, 18b, 20a, 33c, 34c) particularly to eat together the kuriako.n dei/pnon. It is on the occasion of eating together that abuses are made manifest.⁵⁴ Paul mentions the divisions in the Corinthian gathering (v.18), and the observation that some get hungry and some get drunk in the common meal where there are ‘those who have’ and ‘those who do not have’ (vv.21-22). Suzanne Watts Henderson proposes that Paul’s mention of oivki,a in v. 22a and oi;koj in v.34b are indicative not only of place but also of a metaphorical expression for the Christian community to welcome in their midst those who are hungry.⁵⁵ She translates v. 22 as “For is it not that you (pl.) have houses [precisely] for [the community’s] eating and drinking? Or do you show scorn for

⁵¹ The predominant view interpreting 1 Cor 11:17-34 in line with the importance of correct liturgical or sacramental celebration is difficult to hold together in view of vv. 22. 34a. We agree with Suzanne Watts Henderson, “‘If Anyone Hungers…’: An Integrated Reading of 1 Cor 11:17-34” New Testament Studies 48 (2002): 195-208, here 196 that interpretation of vv.22, 34 are usually “maintained, often with a touch of embarrassment, that these verses constitute the necessary escape clause of an at home eating option for the hungering ‘haves’.”

⁵² These are represented in italics in the above chart.


⁵⁴ See Gerd Theissen, “Social Integration and Sacramental Activity: An Analysis of 1 Cor. 11:17-34” in The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1982), 147-163. He proposes that sociological issues on the background of 1 Cor 11:17-34 contribute to the problem of hunger in the Corinthian community. These include the presence of the different groups at the kuriako..n dei/pnon, variable beginnings for the meal, uneven amounts of food and drink, and dissimilar quality of meals.

⁵⁵ Watts Henderson, “‘If Anyone Hungers…’, 203-207. Likewise, see also David G. Horrell, “From avdelfoi, to oi=koj geou/: Social Transformation in Pauline Christianity” JBL 120/2 (2001): 293-311. On p. 298: “A number of other related Greek terms also need to be considered along with oi=koj/oivki,a in a consideration of the use of household language to describe the Christian community in the Pauline letters. Some of these relate more to the notion of the oi=koj as a building-oivkodomh, and oivkodome,w, for exa,ple- and others to oi=koj as household, such as ḥoivkei/oj and oivke,th” Likewise on pp. 303-304: “The use of oi=koj/oivki,a language in Paul’s letters is hard to assess in any meaningful way with statistics, since there is a range of relevant terms that may or may not be used in a manner pertinent to our present concern. As indicated above, the terms and their uses fall into two broad groups (not always clearly distinguishable), according to whether they are describing the act or object of building on the one hand, or the human beings who comprise a household on the other.”
the church of God [by not having all eat and drink] and shame those who don’t have [houses of their own for eating and drinking]?’”56 We follow her integrated interpretation that the problem mentioned by Paul in 11:17 is proposed to be solved in 11:34 with the inclusio of the command to eat, i.e., to eat together in the house where they gather and allowing those who are hungry to eat in their midst.57

An additional insight could be gleaned from 1 Cor 7:26 when Paul writes about a present distress. Some commentators surmise that this could be in reference to the famine around the year 51 which gave rise to the need to have a curator annonae in Corinth.58 If we remember to include this detail in looking at this episode particularly the problem of hunger in 1 Cor 11:17-34, it makes Paul’s censure and correction that the Corinthian church ought to welcome especially their hungry brothers and sisters at the common meal all the more significant. It also offers additional insight on the cause of weakness, illness and death in the community that Paul refers to in v.30.59

But why did Paul use the narrative of the Lord’s Supper according to tradition as his basis for his appeal in Corinth? First and foremost, Paul grounds his censure in the foundational story from a recent past, by giving them a “historically grounded paradigm for transforming the community’s eating and drinking according to the logic of Jesus’ own self-sacrifice.”60 Moreover, in appealing to the narrative, Paul makes the story of Lord’s Supper come alive in a way that makes the Lord’s words rhetorically function as directly addressed to the Corinthians both in the emphasis of u’pe.r u’mw/n (1 Cor 11:24c) as well as the command for remembering, tou/to poiei/te eivj th.n evmh.n avna, mnhsin (v. 24d, 25d). As Watts Henderson also observes, “The narrative effect is to stress the self-giving, sacrificial action on the part of Jesus, not as an empty gesture but as an act performed precisely for the benefit of others” and “this story of the Last Supper is not just a noble act but an example the Corinthians are called to imitate.”61 In appealing to the foundational story in 1 Cor 11:23-25, Paul uses a “narrative remedy” to remind the Corinthians of the symbolic universe which they share not only with Paul but also with the Lord. We now turn to a brief discussion of this symbolic universe.

---

56 Watts Henderson, “‘If Anyone Hungers…’”, 205.
57 Watts Henderson, “‘If Anyone Hungers…’”, 203-208, especially 207, see also 196.
59 See also Watts Henderson, “‘If Anyone Hungers…’”, 206, n.42.
60 Watts Henderson, “‘If Anyone Hungers…’”, 200. See also Hans-Josef Klauck, “Presence in the Lord’s Supper: The Lord’s Supper and the Lord’s Supper Tradition: Reflections on 1 Corinthians 11:23b-25” in One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts, ed. Ben F. Meyer, New Gospel Studies 6 (Macon, GA: Mercer University, 1993), 57-74, especially 64: “Here the ritual practice of the community is anchored in history and referred back to a fixed point in the recent, not to say most recent, past.”
61 Watts Henderson, “‘If Anyone Hungers…’”, 201.
b. The kuriakon dei/phon: Mirror of Symbolic Universe and Social Relations in 1 Cor 11:17-34

The symbolic universe contains traditional knowledge known through language and symbols, which legitimates the formerly referred to social relations and actions of actors and institutions.62 In the characterization that we made in Table 2 of the Lord’s Supper in contrast with the Corinthians’ own, we catch a glimpse of this symbolic universe. In Paul’s idealization of the Lord’s Supper, he initiates the raising of an urgent matter for censure and re-education63 as part of the Corinthians re-socialization.64 In line with this, it seems that there are two most important values that are in need of reiteration and reinforced implementation in relation to the present Corinthian situation. The first is the value following the example of the Lord Jesus as a manifestation of their own journey from being slaves of Christ towards being adopted as God’s children. From the viewpoint of the characterization of the Lord’s Supper that we made in Table 2, we look at the value of following the example of the Lord Jesus as a manifestation of the Corinthians’ own journey towards being adopted children of God.65 Here we can link the importance of the Lord’s Supper being based on the foundational story which is traceable from the Lord on the night he was betrayed (1 Cor 11:23-25) that shows the breaking of the bread and the sharing of the cup as the Lord’s own self-giving of his body and blood “for you” (1 Cor 11:23-25 especially 24c). Second, the Corinthians are equal to each other since they are brothers and sisters, hence they need to treat each other equally.66 This must change the prevailing divisions and distinctions that do not belong to their symbolic

---

62 Petersen, Rediscovering Paul, 57 and x. He follows Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality : A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967), 92-128; See also David G. Horrell, The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interest and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement, SNTW (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 53 prefers to refer to the symbolic “universe” as symbolic “order” and suggests that “Pauline Christianity may best be understood as a symbolic order embodied in communities” (p. 54).


64 The actions of the actors in the letter’s narrative world can be viewed following the sociological insights on socialization, namely primary, secondary and re-socialization. Petersen briefly presents them in the following way. Primary socialization denotes one’s initial socialization and taking on of the ‘world’ of the significant others such as parents or their equivalents, and corresponds to involuntary or existential forms of association. Secondary socialization and re-socialization pertain to sub-worlds or others world which the person voluntarily associates into with the help of significant others that play a determinative though less intimate and more institutional way. Secondary socialization must be assimilated in the primary socialization while re-socialization speaks of the world of primary socialization being replaced by or assimilated within the new world. Berger and Luckmann explain that the re-socialization process is needed in cases that are subjectively apprehended as total transformation or what they call alternation.64 The historical prototype of this alternation that needs the process of re-socialization is that of religious conversion. These processes of socialization are important in understanding what is going on between Paul and the Corinthian church. The Corinthians are initiated in various primary worlds and they are also influenced by the situation in Hellenistic Corinth. But because of becoming a church by baptism, they have entered into the process of re-socialization with Paul as their teacher. On the complex social composition of the Corinthians see, Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, 1 Corinthians, New Testament Message 10 (Dublin: Veritas, 1979), ix-xii; Theissen, Social Setting, 69-119; Horrel, Social Ethics, 91-101. For those who favour that the Corinthian Christians include both Jews and a Gentile majority, see Gordon D. Fee, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 4; Richard B. Hays, First Corinthians, Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1989), 6; Horrell, Social Ethics, 75 and 91; Craig Steven de Vos, Church and Community Conflicts: The Relationships of the Thessalonian, Corinthian, and Philippian Churches with their Wider Civic Communities. SBL DS 168 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1999), 195; Murphy-O’Connor, 1 Corinthians, ix 65 We will elaborate on this under the discussion of the human characters below.

66 Petersen, Rediscovering Paul, 102; See also Horrell, “From avdelfoi, to oikoj geou/,” 297. Contrast Reidar Aasgard, “ ‘Role Ethics’ in Paul: The Significance of the Sibling Role for Paul’s Ethical Thinking” NTS 48 (2002): 513-530, especially 523. According to him Paul and Plutarch recognizes the sibling relationship but “they do not argue in favour of equality in the relationship; rather, inequality is their starting point, something they take for granted. Thus the goal is not the abolition of there differences, but their reduction…”
universe. This is obvious in Paul’s critique and implied command that there should be no division or faction among them and that communal unity should be present. Moreover, the implied description that there should be an equal food and drink distribution is another clear affirmation of this value of treating each other equally.

These abovementioned values are definitely linked to the physical and observable results of the Corinthians’ compliance when they gather together again to celebrate the Lord’s Supper in a house which is considered a house church and a metaphorical designation for the community that ought to welcome those who are hungry. In the kuriako.n dei/pon, hospitality is paramount, partakers wait for each other or welcome each other as brothers and sisters when they come together to eat (1 Cor 11:33b). The texts vv. 21 and 34a are related to one another. The more common translation of prolamba, nw (v. 21a) as “take before” results in translating evkde, comai (v. 34a) as “wait for one another.” A marginal alternative reading translates prolamba, nw as “devour” and, in view of this, translates evkde, comai as “welcome one another.”67 Another reading suggests that in light of sunerce, sqai, fagei/n, and peina/n “Paul not only urges his hearers to welcome or wait one another, they are to let the hungry in their midst eat.”68 All of these translations reflect that in their symbolic universe, which is encapsulated in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, there ought to be acceptance of and respect for the church of God, and there is an ensuing respect and inclusion of ‘those who have not’. Thus, when done properly, the community’s gathering together to eat will not seem to result in weakness, illness and death among them (1 Cor 11:30) as the present context in Corinth seems to suggest.69

These two values (i.e., following the example of the Lord Jesus as a manifestation of their own journey from being slaves of Christ towards being adopted as God’s children, and changing the prevailing divisions and distinctions between ‘those who have’ and ‘those who have not’ as a result of equality among themselves since they are brothers and sisters to one another) are, nevertheless, in connection with an awareness of what the future, in their symbolic universe, entails. Thus, in the same pericope, we find Paul telling the partakers of this supper that they must celebrate in a worthy manner for they are answerable to the body of the Lord (1 Cor 11:27), and that they have to examine themselves lest they

67 For the proponents of this alternative reading see, Winter, “Private Dinner and Christian Divisiveness,” here 144-152; Fee, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 540-542.
69 There are many and various interpretations of this verse. To cite examples, some hold that the weakness, illness and death are related to divine judgment in relation to 10:20, see C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (London: Adam and Charles Black), 275. Others believe they are due to the inappropriate eucharistic behavior, see Collins, First Corinthians, 439; Hans Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1975), 203; Fee, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 565 holds that they are independent present realities in Corinth prophetically judged to be related to the abuses at the Supper. He, nevertheless, hints at the possible relationship of weakness, illness and death with 1 Cor 7:26. Thiselton, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 894, in view of Fee’s position, mentions that since drunkenness is cited in v.21, it is probable that “a serious decline in health could result causally from excess in gluttony and drink which brought its own judgment especially if a wealthy host saw an opportunity to masquerade sheer excess under the cloak of ‘doing the Lord’s work’ by hosting frequent ‘Suppers of the Lord.’” While we agree with Fee that the weakness, illness and death are related to 1 Cor 7:26, we also follow the insight that this verse could refer to the famine in Corinth (see n. 57 above). If we take these factors to be related, then, instead of those who suffer the consequences of gluttony and drunkenness, it would seem that it is ‘those who do not have’ who experience weakness, illness and death as a consequence of the famine. See also Watts Henderson, “ ‘If anyone Hungers…’”, 206, n. 42 comments that “If we take the gravity of the situation to its logical end, a related exegetical move that cannot be developed here would be to construe the judgment of 11:30 (…) as the natural consequence of that hunger” even if she does not have any reference to the famine in Corinth.
incur judgment (vv. 28-34c). If they do all these things that Paul emplots and implies, their supper will be commendable, a kuriako.n dei/pnon indeed.

c. The i;ion dei/pnon, the kuriako.n dei/pnon and Pagsasalu-salo: A Conversation

In engaging the i;ion dei/pnon and kuriako.n dei/pnon from a Filipino meal perspective, we can relate these, to some extent, to a few features in the Filipino pagsasalu-salo. i;ion dei/pnon can somehow be linked to some features of the pakikitungo (level of amenities) (see Table 1). The divisions and factions in 1 Cor 11:18,19 somehow vaguely reflect the wide gap between the guest and the host and highly specialized food is offered to the guest. But there is little convergence in these two meal cultures since in the pakikitungo level good manners are highly observed, the host waits for the guest, and there is a pleasant even though somewhat “stiff” atmosphere which does not seem to be the case in Corinth where some eat ahead or devour the food that they themselves brought (cf. v. 21a e[kastoj ga.r to. i;ion dei/pnon prolamba, nei evn tw/| fagei/n).70 The rest of the description of the i;ion dei/pnon has no parallel with the pakikitungo level.

The kuriako.n dei/pnon is the foundational story of the Lord’s Supper celebration in Corinth, presented by Paul as the ideal way of celebrating the common meal of Christians. Pakikiisa is also the most ideal level of Filipino meal in view of pakikipag-kapwa (shared inner identity). The tabular presentation below shows some of the points of convergence between these two are highlighted by shading. In both, the sense of unity is underscored and division has no room. This is expected both for natural siblings and those who have come to regard each other as such. Likewise, in both, partakers welcome each other, are considerate of each other’s presence and would not allow possible abuse at table which can result in the prevention of adverse physiological effects such as weakness, illness or death. Moreover, both are inclusive and respectful, especially of those who are disadvantaged. In both, equal food and drink distribution is a feature. By critiquing the situation of some going ahead or devouring their meal, of some being drunk and some being hungry in the i;ion dei/pnon, Paul highlights that this should not be the case in the kuriako.n dei/pnon. Pagsasalu-salo in the pakikiisa level takes note of the need for equal food and drink distribution which includes those who are present but extends to those who are late and are absent through the practice of pagtitira (which includes making sure that there is food enough for everyone present, setting aside for those who are late, and keeping and sending food to those who cannot make it) and not only tira-tira (left-overs). Patron-client relationship (sakop) can also have an important role here which we will describe more below. These all amount to the fact that both kuriako.n dei/pnon and pagsasalu-salo (Pakikiisa level) are ideal and commendable expressions of table-fellowship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: The kuriako.n dei/pnon and Pagsasalu-salo (Pakikiisa level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul’s Ideal Lord’s Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuriako.n dei/pnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there should be no division nor faction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communal unity should be present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based on the tradition/foundational story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traceable from the Lord on the night he was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>betrayed (1 Cor 11:23-25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

70 See Bruce Winter, “Private Dinner and Christian Divisiveness: 1 Cor 11:17-34” in After Paul Left Corinth: The Influences of Secular Ethics and Social Change (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2001),142-163 especially his discussion on this verse on pp. 144-151.
The breaking of the bread and the sharing of the cup is the Lord’s own self-giving of his body and blood “for you” (1 Cor 11: 23-25 especially 24c)

Value of *hating-kapatid*
Can potentially enhance the meaning of kuriako.n dei/pnon especially the eucharistic verbs when the value of *hating-kapatid* is invoked

Done in remembrance of the Lord (1 Cor 11:24d, 25d) and it is a proclamation of the Lord’s death until he comes (1 Cor 11:26).

Value of *hating-kapatid*
Can serve as a cultural prompt for the call to remember the example of the Lord (1 Cor 11:24d, 25d)

Partakers of this supper must do so in a worthy manner for they are answerable for the body of the Lord (1 Cor 11:27), they have to examine themselves lest they incur judgment (1 Cor 11:28-34c).

Partakers at table in this level are expected to be conscientious of the others; also calls for self-examination especially when commanded by parents or appealed to by siblings/those who have been recognized as siblings or very close friends

When done properly does not seem to result in weakness, illness and death among them

When abuses are prevented in this level (*walang lamangan*), it can promote physiological health and wellness

Partakers wait for each other or welcome one another as brothers and sisters when they come together to eat in the house (1 Cor 11:33, 22a)

Partakers usually wait for each other; Welcoming one another is a given and in a familiar way

**Equal food and drink distribution**

When participated in properly, it promotes sharing of food among partakers; *hating-kapatid* gives space to *pagtitira* (setting aside food for those who are late or absent) and not *tira-tira* (left-overs)

Patron-client relationship (*sakop*) among siblings plays a role

**Acceptance of and respect for the church of God**

Can promote acceptance of and respect for the church of God but also of the larger group of *kapwa*

**Results in respect and inclusion of those who have not**

Can be appealed to in order that those who have not/those who have not enough can be given a fair share

**Commendable celebration**

Commendable table-fellowship

Nevertheless, there are some features in the kuriako.n dei/pnon and pakikiisa which do not necessarily echo each other but are not opposed to each other. The kuriako.n dei/pnon expectedly includes the features of the meal being a rooten in the Lord’s farewell meal and known for the breaking of the bread and the sharing of the cup, indicative of those who belong to the Christian community.

**Pakikiisa**, on the other hand, is rooted in the Filipino core value of *pakikipagkapwa* (recognition of shared inner self) and, therefore, not limited to those who are Christians but extends to other *kapwa-tao* who are also in need of nourishment and sustenance. We do not discount, however, the possible mutual influence between these two. The eucharistic actions of Jesus in kuriako.n dei/pnon which should be replicated in the community’s regard for each other has a sacrificial and memorial aspect. These are not totally absent in the pakikiisa level of *pagsasalu-salo* especially if the value of *hating-kapatid* is considered which can potentially enhance the meaning of the eucharistic verbs and the command for remembering. This is mostly vivid in the act of the breaking of the bread and the action of *hating-kapatid* (division). Pakikiisa may have a future dimension but no explicitly eschatological motif like the one found in the kuriako.n dei/pnon.
2. The Human Actors in 1 Cor 11:17-34 and Relationship in the Pakikiisa level: A Patron-Client Relationship?

In discussing the relationship between the human actors in the story of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth, we will delve into the relationship among the Corinthians, and between the Corinthians and Paul. Then, we shall see how this relationship can dialogue with the relationship among table-fellows in the pakikiisa level.

a. The Corinthian Christians among themselves

In characterizing the Corinthians in 1 Cor 11:17-34, the clearest reference is that of being a church (of God) (hv evkklhsi,a tou/ qeou/, vv. 18b, 22b) as well as being Paul’s brothers and sisters (avdelfoi,, v. 33b). When Paul speaks of their being church here, it is actually as a critique of the current state of affairs in Corinth. The letter is collectively addressed to the whole church (1:2) but here, Paul is asking them to pay attention to the divisions that exist in the church (11:18c). It would seem that in the relationship among the Corinthians evident in the i;dion dei/pnon, they have forgotten their common identity as a church of God. Among the Corinthians, it would seem that they continue to keep a hierarchy that separates ‘those who have’ (v. 22a) from ‘those who have not’ (v. 22c), those who are drunk (v. 21c) from those who are hungry (v. 21b), those about whom Paul says, e[kastoj ga,r to. i;dion dei/pnon prolamba, nev evn tw/| fagei/n (v. 21a) from those who should be awaited and welcomed (v. 34a). In naming these divisions, Paul seems to recognize and talk to different groups within the Corinthian community but he addresses all of them together in writing about their faulty Lord’s Supper celebration, the i;dion dei/pnon according to Paul. That is why Paul refers to them as evkklhsi,a tou/ qeou/ (vv. 18b, 22b), a more refined characterization of the Corinthian church by personification, the one which suffers the consequences of the divisions, being shown contempt, especially when the division is based on ‘those who have’ and ‘those who do not have’. Paul also continues to use the second person plural of the verbs and the pronoun, including the rhetorical effect u`pe.r u`mw/n (v. 24c), in the rest of the passage that deals with the action that the Corinthians need to do as one community to underscore the Corinthians’ common identity.\(^\text{71}\)

Paul reiterates this common identity not only among the Corinthians but also including himself when he explicitly calls the Corinthians avdelfoi, mou (v. 33b). It shows how he refers back to their kinship relationship as he has addressed the community earlier in the letter.\(^\text{72}\) It proceeds from the implied supposition of God as Father of the believers, (qeou/ patro.j h`mw/n and therefore, that the believers are all children of God.\(^\text{73}\) Petersen highlights the importance of this term by saying that avdelfoi is the primary social category in Paul’s churchly domain which renders everyone equal. This equality is valid in the church which includes the relationship among the Corinthians themselves as well

---

\(^{71}\) Paul does not use the second person personal form of the verb in vv.27-32. The use of the third person singular form tend to refer to anyone in the community (v. 27-30) and the use of the first person plural verbs in vv.31-32 again implies communal identity that now includes even Paul himself.

\(^{72}\) See 1 Co. 1:10, 11 (+ mou), 26; 2:1; 3:1; 4:6; 7:24, 29; 10:1. Likewise after this juncture, 12:1; 14:6, 20, 26, 39 (+ mou); 15:1, 31, 50, 58 (+ mou); 16:15, 20.

\(^{73}\) See Petersen, Rediscovering Paul, 102. Contrast Reidar Aasgard, “Brotherhood and Plutarch and Paul: Its Role and Character” in Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1997), 166-182. Aasgard’s basic position on brotherhood is different from Petersen’s. For Aasgard, Paul “does not argue on the basis of a common origin for the Christians, e.g. that they are the children of God, and therefore one another’s brothers and sisters. This idea may be close at hand (e.g. Rom 8, Gal 3:26 to 4:7), but it is nowhere explicitly mentioned or developed further. Nor does Paul introduce Christ as the one who turns believer into sisters and brothers, whether through baptism or through the Spirit. Furthermore, Paul does not argue from experience in favour of the brotherhood concept. He gives no particular reasons from everyday life why Christians should act in a brotherly way towards one another. Brotherly relations are simply presupposed, and the lack of justification appears somewhat striking (175-176).
as between Paul and the Corinthians. Dennis Smith asserts that “the most likely locus for this development is the community meal, with its unparalleled power to define social boundaries and create social bonding.”

Even if a simple vocative (avdelfoi,) would have sufficed, Paul seems to underline his connectedness with the Corinthians as evidenced by the need to use a possessive personal pronoun (mou). As Collins observes, it strengthens the rhetorical force of the kinship bonds. The most important role of avdelfoi, mou is to point out their common bond that is rooted in regarding God as their Father in their symbolic universe that governs the church. Because of this, we are convinced that Paul was pushing the importance of the kinship metaphor as far as he could to remind the Corinthians that as they celebrate the Lord’s Supper, they are to remember their equal standing in the churchly domain as children of God and regard each other as such—no one is superior or inferior, not ‘those who have’ nor ‘those who have not’, not Paul nor the Corinthians. This equality is the motive for changing their conduct. It is the impetus for living it out in the midst of a society beset by division between those who have and those who have not. The hierarchical tone by the use of command that accompanies this egalitarian kinship designation in v.33) intensifies the importance of maintaining the kinship relationship and expressing it concretely by their actions in the Lord’s Supper celebration. It also sharpens the expected response of obedience from the early Christians in Corinth.

b. Paul
It seems that in this pericope Paul’s roles are mostly implied. Even if he emplot the “I” only in 1 Cor 11:23a and the other references to himself are embedded in the first person singular forms of the verbs (vv. 17b, 18cd, 22def, 23ab, 34d) and some are included in the first person plural form (vv. 31-32b), it seems to carry different implied roles every time he mentions it. We count five of these implied roles. We think that in vv. 17a, 18ed, 22def, 23ab and 34d, Paul is simultaneously implying his role as apostle (see 1:1; 9:1-2; 15:9; likewise 4:9; 9:5; 12:28-29; 15:9), founder of the Corinthian community (see 3:6; 3:10), their teacher (see 4:17; 12:28-29) as well as the father (4:14,15b) and mother of the community (see 3:2) since he is telling the Corinthians that he is not commending their celebration of the Lord’s Supper. Paul earlier implied his action of founding the Corinthian community and being their teacher (11:23) in order to underscore that he is the Corinthian community’s founder and teacher. This gives him a good reason for his right and duty to correct their seeming mistakes since he is fulfilling his multiple implied roles of apostle, founder of the Corinthian community, their teacher as well as the father/mother of the community. Interdependently with each of these roles of Paul, the Corinthians play the role of being church of God which is explicit in the passage, and the implied roles of being founded community and children of Paul for the last two implied roles of Paul. Consequently, Paul’s right and duty to correct the Lord’s Supper practice of the community is based on his role as an apostle of Christ Jesus which is reiterated and strongly implied by his use of the tradition formula in 11:23ab. These roles are also highlighted by his concern for them as he gives them warning about future judgment (vv. 31a-32c). By emphatically calling on the Corinthians as his brothers and sisters in v. 34a, their kinship is implied and his being a brother to them (v. 33b) is emphasized. Among the letters of Paul, 1 Corinthians exhibits the
highest frequency of its usage including the vocative.78 Paul rhetorically uses the vocative in v. 34a; for conflict areas in the community, like the faulty celebration of the Lord’s Supper as a communal meal, are attempted to be solved by appealing to the avdelfoi, relationship79 with all the implied “superior” roles of Paul vis-à-vis the Corinthians remaining in the background.

c. Patron-Client relationship in the kuriakon dei/pnon and Pakikiisa: A Conversation Patron-client relationship80 is part and parcel of the Corinthian Christians’ reality. “The Christian patrons and their private household played a most vital role in the life of the early church... In the first two centuries, the Christian congregations of ‘house churches’ met in private rooms in homes of patrons”81 comments Peter Lampe. Whether in a private household or an apartment, hosts of the meetings of the congregations were construed as the patrons of these congregations but this did not necessarily mean that they hold position over the other members for “Christian patronage did not automatically imply a hierarchical structure.”82 In view of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth, patronage also exerts its influence. Some members who play this part have more influence and have a leading role in the community but it seems that after Paul left Corinth, these patrons “transformed their capability for diakonia to an elitist behaviour and to a privilege of exercising their power on the community” based on the social dynamics and their spirituality and eschatology.83 In 1 Cor 11:17-22, Paul’s critique is meant to tell ‘those who have’ among the Corinthians, the “patrons,” of their responsibility to ‘those who have not’ not only as patrons but also as brothers and sisters. Protection from hunger is, indeed, one of the expected benefits patrons should give to their client84 but it is also the responsibility of siblings to one another.85 Horrell opines: “The prominence of this kinship description would seem to imply that Paul both assumes and promotes the relationship between himself and his addressees, and among the addressees themselves, as one between equal siblings, who share a sense of affection, mutual responsibility, and solidarity.”86 Thus, seen in the broader perspective of famine and the social conventions concerning hospitality and meals, it would seem that Paul advocates in vv. 17-34 that the Corinthian Christians assure that the hungry brothers and sisters are fed in their midst in and through their common gathering to eat, based on the narrative paradigm of the Lord cited by Paul. The secular support of the curator annonae in Corinth in times of famine should be complemented by the communal response which is drawn from the example of the Lord

78 See Reidar Aasgard, ‘My Brothers and Sisters!’: Christian Siblingship in Paul (London/New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 268 notes that of the 64 use of avdelfoi, as address in Paul’s letters, 20 are found in the 1 Corinthians. He also describes that in view of the strength of social cohesion between Paul and the Corinthians their can be considered close and its character can be considered positive (p. 269, n.44).
79 See Aasgard, “Brotherhood and Plutarch and Paul: Its Role and Character,” 166-182, especially 177-178. While he speaks of Paul using siblingship as a means to settle dispute, Aasgard’s basic position is in contrast with that of Petersen and Horrell, see n. 72 above.
80 We follow the explanation of Bruce J. Malina and John J. Pilch, Social-Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2006), 382-383: “Patron-client system are socially fixed relations of generalized reciprocity between social unequals in which a lower-status person in need (called a client) has his or her needs met by having recourse for favors to a higher-status, well-situated person (called a patron).” They explain that this is a typical relationship between the head of the family and his dependents that include wife, children and slaves. Moreover, they explain that Paul’s language of “grace” points to patronage where God is the patron and Jesus is the broker of God’s favor through the Spirit of God (pp. 384-385).
85 See Aasgard, ‘My Brothers and Sisters!', 46 who explains that in times of economic crisis, siblings (specifically brothers), play a central role in taking care of the family needs.
86 Horrell, “From avdelfoi, to oí=koj qeou,” 299.
in vv.23-25. Paul makes it clear that in the kuriako.dei/pnon there can be no room for disunity, selfishness, and fake commensality.

Conversing with Filipino pagsasalu-salo in the pakikiisa level, this theme of patron-client and sibling responsibility in line with providing food for those who hunger is not alien. Table-fellows at this level, who are siblings and regard each other as siblings, can partake of everyday food no matter how meagre it is. Meal sharing in pakikiisa level in times of crisis is facilitated and provided for by the Filipino equivalent of patron-client relationship called sakop which can also exist between siblings. The one who has more, particularly the elder sibling, is expected to act accordingly to provide for those in need both because she or he has more and as such serves as a patron, and because family solidarity by sibling support is expected of her/him. While there is no one designated as curator annonae in the Filipino setting, the same role is played by the sibling who can serve the purpose. While there could be a tendency for those who provide to be proud, this is tempered by the weight of responsibility as sibling.

3. Paul and the Corinthians, Community Conflict and Resolution, and Hating-Kapatid

In the story of the Lord’s Supper in 1 Cor 11:17-34 we see how Paul tells of the problems at the community meal that hints at some conflicts in the community as well as his attempts to help resolve this conflict. We will also try to have a dialogue between this aspect of the story and the Filipino value of hating-kapatid.

---

87 See Kent, Corinth, 74-75 who explains the epigraphic evidence regarding an official response of the Corinthians to famine by the appointment of a curator annonae (curator of the grain supply) named Tiberius Claudius Dinippus. West, Corinth, 71-76, on p.73 explains that the role of a curator annonae like Dinippus is not annually elected but “appointed in times of threatened or actual famine, and often, we may presume, the office fell upon men of wealth who use their private resources to relieve the necessities of the city.” Bruce W. Winter, Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens, First-Century Christians in the Graeco-Roman World (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994) 56 opines that in a situation like this the help that the wealthier members of the church, who serve as benefactors, can extend to those who have nothing is very important. This can take the form of gift or making a financial contribution for the subsidy of buying the staple products such as grain. Winter, “Secular and Christian Responses to Corinthian Famine,” 105 also suggests that the Christian response can also include being eligible to undertake the secular office of a curator annonae but on pp. 103-104 he suggests that it is possible that Paul was reluctant to suggest this in writing lest it heightens the patron-client situation and worsen the divisions in the community. Blue, “The House Church at Corinth and the Lord’s Supper,” 238-239 opines that it is also probable that Paul seem to be dissatisfied with the present scheme and suggests to the Christian community a meal sharing that is based on their mutual love. Hence, Paul could be suggesting “an alternative mechanism within the church to ensure that the economically disadvantaged were taken care of by the church and not the city.” In this paper, we hold that the suggestions of Winter and Blue are not exclusive of each other. In addition to the official response of the city by means of the grain subsidy through the curator annonae, Paul would have liked the church to have a responsible response to the famine based on the Corinthian Christians’ realization of the meaning and implication of the Lord’s Supper which characterize the Christian community.


89 See Dionisio M. Miranda, Loob: The Filipino Within. A Preliminary Investigation into a Pre-Theological Moral Anthropology (Manila: Divine Word Publications, 1989), 85: “Sakop is the acknowledgement by loob of his-being-with others. It means that his identity and fulfillment is not merely an individual affair but must be viewed in terms of reference-groups. It is vertically all-inclusive; kinship includes both living and dead. Sakop is horizontally comprehensive, it embraces all and particularly the most important aspects of life: courtship and marriage, sickness and death, mourning and celebration. It is multiform: sakop can be the family, the barkada (friends), the town, the corporation, the political party. It can function in many ways: as a social security system, as employment agency, as emotional support, etc. (…) It is the communal pact, the social alliance that takes precedence, not the individual’s good or interests.” See also Leonardo Mercado, Elements of Filipino Theology (Tacloban: Divine Word University Publications, 1975), 54-60. From this perspective, we find that sakop echoes some of what is described as a patron-client relationship in the Biblical writings like Paul.
a. The Conflict in the Corinthian Church and Paul’s Attempt at Resolution

In this passage, we have an example of an issue that is not part of the concerns in the letter of the Corinthians to Paul but something that Paul heard of (v. 18c). Paul recognizes, articulates, and narrates to the Corinthians themselves the manifestations of community conflict, namely, divisions and abuses at the kuriako.n dei/pnon. Paul holds these issues to be very important in maintaining the community’s unity as well as in making sure they are faithful to what they commemorate and celebrate in the kuriako.n dei/pnon. For this reason, Paul tries to correct the Corinthian situation in explicit and implied ways.

Explicitly, Paul gives the Corinthians a clear idea of what he finds wrong in their celebration. That the Corinthians did not write about this and yet some still reported it to Paul already indicates that this is a serious issue. In fact, we gather from Paul’s ideological point of view that it is something that disturbs and scandalizes him severely and elicits a strong response from him. As J. C. Hurd observes, in dealing with matters that were not part of the Corinthians’ questions and are derived from the oral information Paul received, “his tone is aroused, even angry.” It is not surprising, then, that we find Paul criticizing the current practice in Corinth sandwiched by a double negation of praise in 11:17b, 22ef.

Having laid down the case, Paul appeals to the foundational narrative and historically grounds the reason for the celebration. He makes use of the story of Jesus’ farewell meal in order to evoke the immediacy of Jesus’ example, purpose and command for remembering. This story provides a contrast characterization of the kuriako.n dei/pnon and the idion dei/pnon. Paul does this to put his criticism in the frame of their symbolic universe that will facilitate the resolution of the community conflict of divisions and abuses at the kuriako.n dei/pnon and to prepare to rouse the Corinthians into a celebration that is more akin to the example set by the Lord and more compliant to his command for remembering. After re-setting the framework in which to continue the communal gathering to eat into one that is attuned to their symbolic universe, Paul explicitly appeals to their common identity as avdelfoi, and commands the welcoming or waiting for the hungry avdelfoi.}

Implicitly, the underlying relationships exert unrecognized yet strong pressure for the Corinthians to correct the situation. Foremost among these relationships are Paul’s manifold “superior” roles as apostle, founder of the Corinthian community, their teacher as well as the father/mother of the community as the background authority for appealing to the foundational story and making exact commands to make the Corinthian gathering to eat more faithful to the kuriako.n dei/pnon. A second factor is the relationship of the Corinthians with one another. Since the conflict has been articulated and laid bare in the community, there is mutual pressure on the divided community to strive for unity and for the abuses to stop. A third factor involves the extra-Corinthian church pressure that includes the other letter sender, Sosthenes, and the other addressees of this letter (1:2). These additional persons who know of the letter and the issues Paul discussed therein are watching what the Corinthians’ next step would be.

All of these explicit and implicit factors combine to let Paul’s expected closure of the Lord’s Supper episode in Corinth in 1 Cor 11:17-34 come about particularly when he writes: 33 {Wste( avdelfoi, mou( sunerco,menoi eivj to. fagei/n avllh,louj evkde,cesqeÅ 34 ei; tij peina/|} ( evn oi;kw| evsqie,tw( i[na mh. eivj kri,ma sune,rchsqeÅ This includes overcoming the divisions and cessation of the abuses at the common meal. If this closural expectation comes to pass, then the Corinthian gathering to eat will truly be for their good (see v. 17c) and it will, indeed, be a kuriako.n dei/pnon. This will be put to the test once Paul comes again to visit (v. 34b).

---

90 Hurd, The Origin of 1 Corinthians, 82. This is followed by Thiselton, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 35.
b. Resolving the Corinthian Community Conflict and Hating-Kapatid: A Conversation

We have seen in 1 Cor 11:17-34 how Paul tries to help the Corinthians resolve the community conflict. What can this text say to the pagsasalu-salo in the pakikiisa level and what can the pakikiisa level of table-fellowship say to the text in view of conflict resolution. As we explained earlier, the degree of relationship can be measured in the way people at table behave towards each other. Just like in 1 Cor 11:17-22, recognition of the abuses at the table-fellowship should be made clear so that particular adjustments and changes can happen. If the abuses in Corinth will be addressed by values found in pakikiisa, one should realize that the mistake has been made in a deep level of relationship by acting in a way that violates the fusion, oneness and lack of social distinction that should pervade the pakikiisa level.

However, the resolution of community conflict can still be further enriched by values upheld in this level. One of the most important values that can be relied on is hating-kapatid. The conflict can be resolved by an authority, who is also in the level of pakikiisa but may not be directly involved in the conflict, that calls on hating-kapatid to remind those who committed the mistake to right their wrong. Internally in the community, those who are hungry and aggrieved can appeal to those in the wrong to make changes by appealing to hating-kapatid. More importantly, the abusers can change their ways and humbly appeal to hating-kapatid so that unity can be restored and the improper celebration of the common meal corrected. This would mean that those who devour food, who do not wait or welcome the hungry avdelfoi, or kapatid must welcome the hungry ones in the common meal or that equal food sharing by means of hating-kapatid results in food set aside for those who come late through pagtitira. Evaluation of the conflict resolution can be done by the authority who appeals to hating-kapatid (like Paul’s attempt to help resolve the conflict) but also by those directly involved, both those who made the mistake of not sharing food and those who were aggrieved.

Conclusion:
In this paper, we attempted to have a conversation between a narrative-critical study of the story of the Lord’s Supper in Corinthians and the lowland Filipino context and its three aspects of hunger, meal culture particularly pagsasalu-salo and the value of hating-kapatid, as well as a narrative approach that is sensitive to characterization.

In this study we tried to approach the episode of the Lord’s Supper story in 1 Cor 11:17-34 from a narrative perspective. With the help of Petersen’s sociology of the narrative world when we considered the roles of the human characters in the story particularly Paul and the Corinthians and the non-human characters, kuriako.n dei/pnon and i;idon dei/pnon. Our attention to Paul’s point of view influenced our understanding of the plot particularly his use of the foundational story to give basis for the celebration and to provide a narrative paradigm for the Corinthians before he gave them his specific command on the necessary change of meal conduct. This sensitivity to point of view also helped us in dealing with the main concern of characterizing the actors in this story, both in the explicit and implied manner. We then tried to have a triple conversation regarding (1) i;idon dei/pnon, kuriako.n dei/pnon and pagsasalu-salo, (2) patron-client relationship in the kuriako.n dei/pnon and pakikiisa, and (3) resolving the Corinthian community’s conflict and the value of hating-kapatid.

These insights may be affirmed or critiqued when this story of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth is read with other lowland Filipino Christians, especially with those who celebrate the Eucharist and those who wait begging for food outside of the church. We hope that this dialogue between the story of the kuriako.n dei/pnon in 1 Cor 11:17-34 and the lowland Filipino Christians may influence the continued retelling of the story of Jesus’ farewell meal and celebrating it with a renewed fervour in a way that is more
cognizant of their impact on present day challenges such as hunger and our individual and common responsibilities as table-fellows for those who are hungry.

An attempt at a contextual interpretation of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth is significant since the most common interpretation of Paul’s command to the Corinthians to redress the issue in v.33 has been used to separate liturgical/sacramental life from the challenges of everyday life and to justify and perpetuate this separation. The same is true with current Filipino translations of the text. This is equally important because the episode in 1 Cor 11:17-34 is seldom read fully in the liturgical readings of the church. It is usually read on Holy Thursday but limited to the foundational story in vv. 23-26 while the rest of the narrative of the faulty celebration of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth is silenced. The whole text is not allowed to question if our present liturgical practice is akin to the Corinthian version, an idion dei/pnon or one that is faithful to the Lord and the avdevoi, in the evkkhlhsi,a tou/ qeou/, a kuriako.n dei/pnon indeed. Finally, the result of our contextual reading beckons us to be cognizant, responsible and creative in our hermeneutical task, in our liturgical and social meal celebration, and our common response as a Church of the Poor to the injustice of hunger that plague not only lowland Filipino Christians but a billion people around the world.

APPENDIX: The Text: 1 Corinthians 11:17-34

17a Tou/to de. paragge,llwn  
17b ouvk evpainw  
17c o[ti ouvk eivj to. krei/sson avlla. eivj to. h-sson sune,rcesqeÅ  
18a prw/ton me.n ga.r  
18b suercome,nwn u`mw/n evn evkklhsi,a|  
18c avkou,w sci,smata evn u`mi/n u`pa,rcein  
18d kai. me,roj ti pisteu,wÅ

91 See, for example, Biblia ng Sambayanang Pilipino (Quezon City: Claretian Publications/Makati: Saint Paul Publications,1990) which translates v. 21-22 as “Sapagkat pag kumakain, nagmamadali at bawat isa sa sarili niyang pagkain, at may nagugutom at may nalalasing. 22 Wala ba kayong sariling bahay upang doon kumain at uminom?” and v.33-34a “Kaya, mga kapatid, kung magkakatipon kayo dahil sa hapunan, maghintay kayo 34 at kung may nagugutom, kumain sa bahay…” See also Ang Biblia para sa Makabagong Filipina (Manila: Philippine Bible Society, 2005) which translates the following verses: 21 Sapagkat ang bawat isa sa inyo’y nagmamadali sa pagkain ng kanyang baong pagkain, kaya’t nagugutom ang iba at ang iba naman’y nalalasing. 22 Wala ba kayong sariling bahay upang doon kumain at uminom? ... 33 Kaya nga, mga kapatid, kapag nagkakatipon kayo upang kumain, maghintay kayo. 34 Kung may nagugutom, kumain na muna siya sa bahay ... The underlined word in v. 22 “sarili” is a possessive personal pronoun (which is not in the Gk text) and the double underlined words in v.34, (which is not also in the Gk text) indicate temporal and spatial separation between the personal house and the house where the community gathers. These additions results in a translation that furthers the separation of those who hunger from the common meal in the kuriako.n dei/pnon.

19a dei/ ga.r kai. ai`re, seij evn u`mi/n ei=nai(19b i[na Íkai.Ô oi` do, kimoi faneroi. ge, nwntai evn u`mi/nÅ
20a Sunercome, nwn ou=n u`mw/n evpi. to. auvto.
20b ouvk e;stin kuriako/n dei/pnon fagei/n\21a e[ka\dion dei/pnon prolamba, nei evn tw/| fagei/n(21b kai. o]j me.n peina/|21c o]j de. mequ, eiÅ
22a mh. ga.r oivki, aj ouvk e; cete eivj to. evsqi, ein kai. pi, neinÈ22b h' th/j evkklhsi, aj tou/ qeou/ katafronei/te(22c kai. kataiscu, nete tou=j mh. e; contajÈ
22d ti, ei; pw u`mi/nÈ22e evpaine, sw u`ma/jÈ22f evn tou, tw| ouvk evpainw/Å

23a VEGw. ga.r pare, labon avpo. tou/ kuri, ou(23b o] kai. pare, dwka u`mi/n(23c1 o[ti o` ku, rioj VIhsou/j evn th/| nukti.23d h-| paredi, deto
23c2 e; laben a; rton24a kai. euvcaristh, saj e; klasen24b kai. ei=pen(
24c Tou/to, mou, evstin to. sw/ma to. u`pe.r u`mw/n\24d tou/to poiei/te eivj th.n evmh.n avna, mnhsinÅ
25a w`sau, twj kai. to. poth, rion meta. to. deipnh/sai25b le, gwn(25c Tou/to to. poth, rion h` kainh. diagh, kh25d1 tou/to poiei/te(
25c Tou/to to. poth, rion h` kainh. diaqh, kh25d1 tou/to poiei/te(
25d2 eivj th.n evmh.n avna, mnhsinÅ
26a o`sa, kij eva.n pi, nhnte(26b kai. to. poth, rion pi, nhnte(26c to.n qa, naton tou/ kuri, ou katagge, llete26d a; crij ou- e; lgh|Å
27a [Wste
   27b o]j a'n evsqi,h| to.n a;rton
   27c h' pi, nh| to. poth, rion tou/ kuri, ou avnaxi, wj
27d e;nocoj e; stai tou/ sw, matoj kai. tou/ ai[matoj tou/ kuri, ouÅ
28a dokimazetw de. a;nqrwpoj e`auto,n
28b kai. ou[twj evk tou/ a;rtou evsqie, tw
28c kai. evk tou/ pothri, ou pine, tw
29a o` ga.r evsqi, wn kai. pi, nwn kri, ma e`autw/| evsqi, ei kai.
          pi, nei
29b mh. diakri, nwn to. sw/maÅ
30 dia. tou/to evn u` mi/n polloi. avsqenei/j kai. a;rrwstoi kai.
           koimw/ntai i` kanoi, Å
   31a eiv de. e`autou.j diekri, nomen(
   31b ouvk a`n evkrino, meqa\
   32a krino, menoi de. u` po. Ítou/DI kuri, ou
   32b paideuo, meqa(  
           32c i[na mh. su.n tw/| ko, smw| katakriqw/menÅ
33a, w[ste(  
33b avdelfoi, mou(  
          33c sunerco, menoi eivj to. fagei/n
33a2 avllh, louj evkde, cesqeÅ  
            34a ei; tij peina/| (  
34b evn oi; kw| evsqie, tw(  
    34c i[na mh. eivj kri, ma sune, rchsqeÅ
34d1 Ta. de. loipa.  
            34e w`j a'n e; lqw
34d2 diata, xomaiÅ