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* Retrieve the professor’s notes and organize a Notebook to **have in front of you while you are listening to the lectures**. This will provide a place for notes and additional ideas for future study.
* Retrieve / **Purchase a Commentary or more for study during the lectures**. If you are only able to study in “English,” the works by Talbert and Garland will serve you well. If you want to read more advanced commentaries, and you can do so even without knowledge of Greek, then Ciampa/Rosner. Fee, Fitzmyer and Thistelton will round out your research at a higher level. DO NOT sell yourself short, read above your ability to learn. REMEMBER, commentaries are for research. They are not like “novels” that are to be read like an ordinary book. Rather they are tools to dig out the meaning of texts to enhance your understand of the Bible as it came to us from the Apostles.
* If possible, you should carve out a consistent time each week to listen to lectures when you will not have major interruptions. **Effective learning requires focus.**
* Feel free to contact the professor via the email above.

**The video lectures are coordinated with the Note files that are provided. ALWAYS have the appropriate Note pack as you begin a session. The instructor will always start by directing you to the Note pack. The notes are outlines with texts that will help you to procure the information provided and do further research on your own. Because of the format of these videos, the Notes serve as the Professor’s Chalkboard to help illustrate the lectures. The Note pack and the Video may not always be the same length (that is, the videos will be 30-45 minutes and the lectures will start and stop at points in the Notes) as a given Note file. But the Instructor will orient you to where he is in the flow of the Notes.**

**The lectures herein are a product of the professor’s own study. PLEASE remember that many opinions exist, even among qualified commentators, on the text we will study. There is nothing new under sun in biblical interpretation. Rather, “Originality is not so much a matter of content as it is a matter of individual treatment” (source forgotten!). These lectures will expose you to numerous “views” on issues in 1 Corinthians and will always be a product of the professor’s perceptions. Your task, is to listen, reflect, and then do your own research to validate your understanding of the biblical text. The meaning of the Bible is not what you think, but what you can validate by disciplined research thinking.**
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***So Many Bibles, So Little Time!***

Gary T. Meadors, Th.D.

I. Brief Historical Overview of the Manuscript Tradition of the Bible

 A. Old Testament (Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek)

Septuagint / LXX (Greek translation of Hebrew during 3-2nd century B.C.)

 Dead Sea Scrolls (2-1st century B.C.)

 Masoretic Text (Standardized by 9th century A.D.)

1. New Testament (Greek)

There are 5,196+ manuscripts from the 2nd to the 16th century. Of these, 3,032 are Greek manuscripts and 2,164 are Greek lectionaries. Of this total, only 318 items come before the 9th century A.D. and the rest thereafter. In addition to this evidence, there are numerous versions and the Church Fathers.

 C. English Versions (Comment about other language Bibles)

* The Bishop of Rome commissioned Jerome to do a Latin translation of the Bible in 382. This version was culminated at Bethlehem about 404 C.E. The Vulgate was the Bible of the Western Church for over a thousand years and only those who knew Latin had access to it. Gutenberg printed Jerome’s version in 1452-56. A Greek New Testament was not printed until Erasmus’ in 1514 (the Complutensian Polyglot was fully published in 1520).
* John Wyclif (1329-1384) at Oxford resisted the Roman Church ban on translating the Bible into the venacular (only Latin Vulgate was sanctioned). Wyclif and his associates provided a too literal translation of the Vulgate. This virtually “underground” rendition was strongly resisted by Rome, so much so that the Council of Constance in 1414 ordered Wyclif’s body disinterred and burned.
* William Tyndale (1526) printed the NT in 1525 but was executed (1536) before finishing the OT. Religious intrigue was the *modus operandi* until Tyndale’s death. Afterward, politics changed and England became a hotbed for translating the Bible into the venacular.
* Coverdale (1535)
* The Great Bible (1539)
* Geneva Bible (1560)
* Bishops’ Bible (1568)
* King James Version (1611) This version began about 1604 with about 54 translators involved (only 47 names preserved). The KJV was as controversial as any new translation, but it managed to dominate until a new revision was commissioned in 1870. See the American Bible Society Chart attached.

For more information about the KJV and its translators see:

 McClure, Alexander W. *The Translators Revived*. New York: Board of Publication of the Reformed Dutch Church, 1855.

 Opfell, Olga S. *The King James Bible Translators*. London: McFarland, 1982.

 Paine, Gustavus S. *The Learned Men*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1959 [reprinted by Baker as *The Men Behind the King James Version*].

II. Defining English Bible Translation Procedures

 A. Formal Equivalence (e.g. KJV, ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, TaNaKh)

All of these English translations are revisions of the KJV (except the TaNaKh, which is a fresh Jewish “literal” rendition). They all follow a formal equivalence procedure for translation. Dr. Bruce Metzger explains this by his comment in the introduction to the NRSV, “…the directive to continue in the tradition of the King James Bible, but to introduce such changes as are warranted on the basis of accuracy, clarity, euphony, and current English usage. Within the constraints set by the original texts and by the mandates of the Division, the Committee has followed the maxim, “As literal as possible, as free as necessary.” As a consequence, the New Revised Standard Versions (NRSV) remains essentially a literal translation.” [The NRSV is receiving criticism for allowing modern cultural pressure to detract from formal equivalency, e.g. gender issues.] A “literal translation” requires more from the reader since the translators do very little interpretive adjustments.

 B. Dynamic [“functional”] Equivalence (NIV/moderate, NLT/aggressive)

This translation procedure is well explained in the introduction to the New Living Translation Bible (a revision of The Living Bible). “A dynamic equivalence translation can also be called a thought-for-thought translation, as contrasted with a formal equivalence or word-for-word translation. Of course, to translate the thought of the original language requires that the text be interpreted accurately and then be rendered in understandable idiom.” A “dynamic equivalence” translation is an interpretive translation (some have changed the term “dynamic” to “functional”). It therefore requires less judgment from the reader since the translators have included their interpretation of texts ambiguous in English in their renditions.

C. Other Procedures (paraphrase, amplified, renditions from English to English! Gender inclusive translations, current culture agenda renditions)

 D. Recommendations

1. Choose Bibles that use a paragraph format. The older “every verse

in the left hand column” type of Bible leads to a proof text mentality rather than an understanding of context. A paragraph is a unit of thought and determines how the sentences in the paragraph should be interpreted.

2. Choose several Bibles for comparative study (KJV, NASB, NIV, NLT). Watch how the dynamic/functional equivalent versions interpret your formal equivalent control Bible. **SEE CHART**.

3. Be careful with “Study” Bibles when they chop up the text for their
 own outlines.

4. Avoid the expanded paraphrase kinds of Bibles. Be a solid Bible reader, not faddish.

5. Be a student of the Bible. This is every Christian’s responsibility.

**Recommended Reading on the History of the Bible**

Ackroyd, P. R. and Evans, C. F., editors. *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. 3
 volumes. London: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Lewis, Jack P. *The English Bible From KJV to NIV: A History and Evaluation*. Grand
 Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981. [See particularly his chapter on “Doctrinal Problems in the King James Version”]

**Transmission of the Bible**

Aland, Kurt and Aland, Barbara. *The Text of the New Testament*.
 Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987. [revised and enlarged
 edition, 1989]

Carson, D. A. *The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism*. Grand Rapids:
 Baker Book House, 1979.

Metzger, Bruce M., and Ehrman, Bart D. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. Fourth Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Mulder, Martin Jan. *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew
 Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

**English Bible Versions**

Brunn, Dave. *One Bible, Many Versions: Are All Translations Created Equal?* Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2013.

Kubo, Sakae and Specht, Walter F. *So Many Versions? 20th Century English Versions of
 the Bible*. Revised and Enlarged Edition. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983.

Ryken, Leland. *The Word of God in English: Criteria for Excellence in Bible Translation*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2002.

Metzger, Bruce M. *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions*. Grand
 Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.

**Gender in Translation Debate**

Carson, D. A. *The Inclusive Language Debate: A Plea for Realism*. Grand Rapids:
 Baker Books, 1998.

Strauss, Mark L. *Distorting Scripture? The Challenge of Bible Translation & Gender Accuracy*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998.

III. Understanding English Bible Versions and Translation Procedures
 In the following chart, read from left to right (i.e. from formal to functional/dynamic) and
 observe how translation theory renders interpretive judgments into the final product.

While some would criticize rendering the Bible in other-than-a-“literal” manner, when you understand the theory and read comparatively, you will find yourself seeing the

process of interpretation as a process of clarifying the meaning of a text. With the proliferation of bible translations, you must educate yourself about how translation is done and the product it provides.

|  |
| --- |
| **ILLUSTRATING RESULTS OF FORMAL TO DYNAMIC TRANSLATION** |
| Texts | Formal Equivalence King James (KJV) Revised Standard (NRSV) | Dynamic Equivalence 1New International Version (NIV, 1978. See Note below) | Dynamic Equivalence 2New Living Translation (NLT) |
| John 3:16 | For God so loved the world, that he gave his **only begotten Son**,…. | For God so loved the world that he gave his **only Son**,…. | For God so loved the world that he gave his **one and only Son**,…. | For God so loved the world that he gave his **only Son**,… |
| Acts 26:28 | Then Agrippa said unto Paul, **Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian**. | Agrippa said to Paul, “**Are you so quickly persuading me to become a Christian**?” | Then Agrippa said to Paul, “**Do you think that in such a short time you can persuade me to be a Christian?**” | Agrippa interrupted him. “**Do you think you can make me a Christian so quickly?**” |
| Galatians 5:4 | Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of **you are justified by the law**; ye are fallen **from** grace. | **You who want to be justified by the law** have cut yourselves off from Christ, you have fallen **away from** grace. | **You who are trying to be justified by law** have been alienated from Christ; you have fallen **away from** grace. | For **if you are trying to make yourselves right with God by keeping the law**, you have been cut off from Christ! You have fallen **away from** God’s grace. |
| Philippians 3:6 | Concerning zeal, persecuting the church; touching the **righteousness which is in the law**, blameless. | As to zeal, a persecutor of the church; **as to righteousness under the law**, blameless. | As for zeal, persecuting the church; as for **legalistic righteousness**, faultless. | And zealous? Yes, in fact, I harshly persecuted the church. And **I obeyed the Jewish law so carefully** that I was never accused of any fault. |
| **ILLUSTRATING RESULTS OF FORMAL TO DYNAMIC TRANSLATION** |
| Texts | Formal Equivalence King James (KJV) New Revised Standard(NRSV)  | Dynamic Equivalence New International Version (NIV) | Dynamic Equivalence 2New Living Translation (NLT) |
| Matthew 19:9 | And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, **except for fornication**, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.  | And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, **except for unchastity**, and marries another commits adultery. | I tell you that anyone who divorces his wife, **except for marital unfaithfulness**, and marries another woman commits adultery. | And I tell you this, a man who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery—**unless his wife has been unfaithful**. |
| 1 Corinthians 5:5 | To deliver such an one unto Satan **for the destruction of the flesh**, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. | you are to hand this man over to Satan **for the destruction of the flesh**, so that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord.  | hand this man over to Satan, **so that the sinful nature may be destroyed** and his spirit saved on the day of the Lord.  | Then you must cast this man out of the church and into Satan’s hands, **so that his sinful nature will be destroyed** and he himself will be saved when the Lord returns. |
| 1 Corinthians 7:1 | Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me: **[It is] good for a man not to touch a woman**. | Now concerning the matters about which you wrote: **"It is well for a man not to touch a woman."** | Now for the matters you wrote about: **It is good for a man not to marry.** | Now about the questions you asked in your letter. **Yes, it is good to live a celibate life**. |
| 1 Thessalonians 1:3 | Remembering without ceasing your **work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope** in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father; | remembering before our God and Father your **work of faith and labor of love and steadfastness of hope** in our Lord Jesus Christ. | We continually remember before our God and Father your **work produced by faith, your labor prompted by love, and your endurance inspired by hope** in our Lord Jesus Christ. | As we talk to our God and Father about you, we think of your **faithful work, your loving deeds, and your continual anticipation of the return of our Lord** Jesus Christ. |
| 1 Timothy 3:11 | Even so [must their] **wives** [be] grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things.  | **Women**, likewise must be serious, not slanderers, but temperate, faithful in all things. | In the same way, their **wives** are to be women worthy of respect, not malicious talkers but temperate and trustworthy in everything.  | In the same way, their **wives** must be respected and must not speak evil of others. They must exercise self-control and be faithful in everything they do. |

ADD…1 Cor 11:10 comparing the TNIV and NIV !! ; Cf. Hosea 9:7 “man of the spirit”; 1 Cor 2:13 ?? 1 Thess 1: “inspired by” in NRSV; cf. 1 Thess 1:11 translation of goodness and following genitive.

**NIV NOTE**: In the above version comparisons, the NIV is the original edition of 1978. In 2011, the NIV underwent a major revision and was reissued. The 2011 revision **corrected** a lot of “poor” renditions, therefore messing up my illustrations in this chart!! Consequently, to be fair to the NIV, the 2011 edition should be included along side the original edition. By doing this, you can see not only the original questionable translation examples and you will also see how it took decades for these renditions to be “reversed” in the 2011 revision. The NIV is to be commended for these updates.

***HOW* DOES THE BIBLE TEACH US?**

**THREE LEVELS OF BIBLICAL TEACHING**

[or, A Primer for Understanding Theological Differences that Arise in the Church]

Gary T. Meadors, Th.D.

Emeritus Professor of Greek and New Testament

Grand Rapids Theological Seminary

(www.gmeadors.com)

One of the fascinating aspects of the Christian journey is to observe how many different assertions can be made from the same biblical text! So what does 1 Timothy 2:12 teach about the role of women in ministry? Or, what is your view on the role of miraculous gifts today? It depends on whom you ask, or perhaps, which book you read. OK, so those are hard ones. Let’s make it easier. What is your view of church government?! Or, what is your view of the “end times?” Has the proverbial iceberg even reached the surface?[[1]](#footnote-1)

The fact of this variety does not argue that all views are equally valid. Rather, it merely illustrates that throughout history the Bible has been subject to many different readings. This can be as serious as major religious constructs that all use the Bible more-or-less, e.g. Judaism, Christianity, Mormonism, Seventh Day Adventist or the great variety of denominations, or various views of texts in the gender/sexuality debate within evangelicalism. Everyone is using the same Bible and saying something radically different! This variety illustrates the need to have some basic parameters for evaluating the meaning of texts that any valid interpretation must follow…hence the literature of hermeneutics.

It is no wonder that the church has fallen on hard times in terms of reading and using the Bible. They don’t know what to do with it. This is further aggravated in American culture by the downgrading of training in biblical studies for ministry. I observed these trends within college and seminary education for over thirty years. Consequently, when theological differences arise, how do we lead people to think about the issues and come to reasonable conclusions that promote the health of the church? In the not too distant past, those who held different views, say for example, about millennial and tribulation views, drew battle lines and mustered every conceivable argument to bomb their opponents (my militaristic language is not accidental).[[2]](#footnote-2) Today, however, it seems that some influential church leaders downplay, if not criticize, theological debate. It is too divisive, they say.

I think there is a better way. It is not an easy way. In fact, it is a way that goes against the grain of the past (i.e. finding “the” view) and aggravates the current trends of downright biblical ignorance. This way does not solve all the problems. In fact, it will put new ones on the table! But it is a way that can bring better understanding to difficult issues so that reasonable people can maintain unity in the midst of diversity.

The present document will only sketch the broad outline of a paradigm that can assist the identification and processing of theological differences. But it is a start.

 *Locating the Bible and its Readers*

When we use the Bible as a source of knowledge and make claims about what it teaches, we engage the discipline of epistemology (= the sources, nature and validity of knowledge). How do we know what we claim to know and why is our view more valid than another?

The *fact* that we have one inspired text and many uninspired interpreters is evidenced by the great variety of views that have always existed with Judaism and Christianity. While there are some core beliefs that have bound these religions to the Bible, there has never been a fully unified theology in either. Why? If we have one Bible and one God, why has this kind of unity never existed? Furthermore, some claim that the Holy Spirit is the trump card and “tells” us what Scripture means. This last claim seems odd, even arrogant, in light of the fact that several equally godly and trained scholars can come to radically different conclusions [the so-called idea of “illumination” that claims the conveyance of interpretive content is a popular level misunderstanding of the biblical concept of the “witness of the Spirit”].

Does this mean we are condemned to relativism in interpretation? No. It merely means, in a worldview kind of way, that God has chosen to give us an inspired text but not inspired interpreters. For reasons beyond our knowing, God has ordained to allow this diversity and not intervene. My personal opinion is that God has set up a situation that allows risk and tension so that we can reflect that we are created in the image of God by how we deal with it.

There are, of course, many theological issues around which believers are unified. It would be impossible to assign percentages of unity and diversity and it is needless. What we do need to engage is “how do we handle our diversity?”

*Locating How the Bible Teaches*

I believe there is a paradigm that can help us reflect on how to understand the unity and diversity of interpretation that we experience. I call it “The Three Levels of How the Bible Teaches.” Before I define the model, it is helpful to review the domain of biblical and theological interpretation known as “The Theological Encyclopedia.”

Christian study is such a broad and complex task it requires numerous professional fields of study in order to pursue meaning. The following chart (credits to James Grier who developed the idea from ‘Westminster divines’ with modest revisions by Meadors) images the “encyclopedia” of the tasks involved with the study of Scripture.

Please think through the pyramid chart:

 **THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA**

|  |
| --- |
| **MINISTRY THEOLOGY**Doing theology in the context of ministry |

|  |
| --- |
| **APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY**Theology’s defense of its conceptual framework |

|  |
| --- |
| **PHILOSOPHICAL THEOLOGY**Theology’s evaluation and interaction with creation’s struggles |

|  |
| --- |
| **SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY**A Church or tradition brings into reflective focus its own teaching based on its derived conceptual model |

|  |
| --- |
| **HISTORICAL THEOLOGY**A record of the church’s reflection upon its own theological development |

|  |
| --- |
| **BIBLICAL THEOLOGY**Provides structural and conceptual model within which exegesis operates |

|  |
| --- |
| **EXEGESIS**Competency to make reasoned judgments about biblical texts. Even prior to exegesis is textual criticism that establishes the text to be studied. |

The various disciplines that comprise the encyclopedia are to be integrated not bifurcated. The work of interpretation, however, must begin with the foundation of the triangle, the task of unpacking the meaning of the biblical text itself, and move to the top. ***A reverse process reads “into” the text rather than “from” it.*** If the initial work of exegesis and biblical theology is flawed, everything that follows is tainted.

From the bottom up, the first two categories order the actual speech of the Bible. Their goal is to let the Bible be the Bible on its own terms and unpack what it actually says, not what we want it to say. This is our best effort toward the “direct” teaching of Scripture. The continuing categories draw from the first two and contextualize Scripture into our own time and place to address the “implicational” and “creative construct” levels of teaching (see following discussion).

The next paradigm chart addresses the question, “How does the Bible teach us?” I would suggest a model of three levels by which the Bible teaches us in consort with our own interpretive skills. We will use the following diagram as a paradigm for this model.

 **THREE LEVELS OF BIBLICAL TEACHING**

**IMPLIED**

**DIRECT**

**Theological Analysis High Taxonomy**

**CREATIVE**

**CONSTRUCT**

**Teaching**

**Intent**

 **Low Taxonomy**

Christians affirm that the Bible is their ultimate source of knowledge for faith and practice. But when they look for a biblical passage that addresses the questions of their current setting they often discover that there is *not* a text that *direct*ly addresses their concerns. In order to compensate, they become ventriloquists, using the Bible as the dummy to say what they want to hear. The words of the texts seem to correlate with their question, but the contextual meaning of the passage they are forcing to serve their purposes has nothing to do with the subject queried. This is a reality we have all observed, been victimized by, and perhaps even practiced! This scenario merely illustrates that sometimes believers do not know how to read the Bible beyond a proof-text-for-my-pretext level.

Let’s unpack the meaning of this chart.

Biblical teaching is developed in at least three levels: Direct, Implied and Creative Constructs (see Chart).

1. The DIRECT TEACHING LEVEL relates to discerning the authorial-textual intension of a given context. This teaching might be as straightforward as a simple imperative, “Thou Shalt not…,” or as complex as an extended narrative. The supreme commands of the bible, to love God and your neighbor, seem simple until we ask, “What does that entail?” Direct teaching is not necessarily simple teaching but the starting point seems “clear”. Exegesis and biblical theology tend to work on the direct level.
2. The IMPLIED TEACHING LEVEL relates to concepts that are not directly stated by biblical words in a context but are teachings that the believing community recognize as the extensions of biblical statements and contexts. This level accounts for a number of crucial doctrines. For example, we hold the doctrine of trinity as essential for Christian thought, but it is an implied rather than a direct teaching. Alister McGrath observed, “The doctrine of the trinity can be regarded as the outcome of a process of sustained and critical reflection on the pattern of divine activity revealed in scripture, and continued in Christian experience. This is not to say that Scripture contains a doctrine of the trinity; rather, Scripture bears witness to a God who demands to be understood in a trinitarian manner.” (*Christian Theology: An Introduction*. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997, p. 294] Much of the work of the early Church Fathers in creedal development evidences this category. Many of the core concepts of the systematic theology disciplines also reflect this category.
3. The CREATIVE CONSTRUCT LEVEL is the product of selecting one’s view of macro understandings of how the Bible has framed certain subjects. For example, are you premillennial or amillennial? Are you a covenant theologian or a dispensationalist or some other construct that provides a synthesis of the whole Bible? Are you an arminian or a calvinist…or just confused?![[3]](#footnote-3) These views of the whole Bible are large frames that help interpreters’ exposit the sense of the whole from its parts. *Constructs are the product of our sustained reflection upon texts, but they are seldom proven from any specific direct context.* Constructs are the product of an inductive process. The use of inductive logic brings another perspective to the nature of creative constructs. It is impossible to address this dimension with brevity, but let me put it this way. We have a Bible that is the product of revelation (deductive), but we use “inductive Bible study methods” to unpack it. In formal logic, deductively sound arguments can lead to certainty, but induction only leads to degrees of probability. Consequently, no matter how tightly argued and how convinced we are about our creative construct systems, they are still only in the realm of probability not certainty. Heated theological debates are the result of conflicting views/constructs about texts/subjects.

While creative constructs often emerge as large paradigms, they are not limited to that.  There are many legitimate CCs.  But there are bad CC readings. For example, "Abstain from all appearance of evil" (1 Thess 5:22, KJV) has often been used to whip people into submission to a viewpoint.  They claim that this text = guilt by association.  BUT that is a bad creative construct from a surface reading of the words forced on the text.  When studied, this text means, "avoid every form/kind of evil" (which is more concrete in definition).  Avoid murder, lying, etc.  Not avoid a restaurant that serves booze!  Or a movie theater!  To force guilt by association on this text is neither direct nor implied but their imagination (bad CC).

As you move from the bottom of the triangle upward, you move from “simple” direct teaching to more sophisticated theological structures, from “teaching intent” that the basic features of the text can sustain to complex lines of reason that comprise “theological analysis.” You move from a “low taxonomy” (= brute facts) to a “high taxonomy” (sophisticated systems of thought).

Every subject or text we study must be evaluated against these three levels of teaching. Where does our “claimed” text rest on the pyramid? One’s confidence and humility of conviction should also be scaled in concord with the appropriate level. One’s willingness to compromise for the sake of the community is also related to this scale. We might die for the Trinity, but not for a certain eschatological position. One’s ability not to be manipulated by others can also be controlled with this model. If someone claims a view that is only their construct, you have no obligation to conform to their view of things. The model also gives you a base line for discussion of your different views on the text. All of us have a propensity to deify our own views from time to time. American Christianity is drunk with individualism derived from our culture. With this individualism comes the assumption of self-authenticating authority. Theology, however, requires a community.

We should perceive that as we go up the pyramid we are in the process of relating an ancient text written in ancient settings to modern questions. For example, is slavery an acceptable practice as “God’s will?” Most would say no. But how do you argue your view when there is no “proof text” to support your position? Furthermore, how do you avoid the embarrassment of biblical silence in relation to certain modern issues? In essence, how the Bible is *relevant* in the progress of history when culture moves “beyond” out-dated mores is a major challenge to hermeneutics. This is a more advanced discussion than the reflections of this handout can provide (For a fuller study of this see Gary T. Meadors, editor, *Four Views on Moving from the Bible to Theology*, Zondervan, 2009).

In addition to this discussion of the interpretation of Scripture, there is also the next question, “How is Scripture applied in our modern setting?” (the issue of “application”, or “contextualization” of texts to current culture). The three levels assist us in this discussion as well, but not for this handout.

As we move through our study of 1 Corinthians, we will encounter numerous texts that the literature presents a variety of views to understand these texts. Each argument/view will need to be judged on the scales of how the text/s that the view claims relate to these three levels.

Every time someone claims that a text means this or that, you need to be prepared to identify whether that text relates to your view at the direct, implied or creative construct level.

I finish my contribution here and share an additional and complementary model used by Walter Kaiser.

A third paradigm can assist us in the application of Scripture, at least for some questions. This paradigm comes from the legal community and is called “**The Ladder of Abstraction.”** Walter Kaiser has transferred this concept to how the NT uses the OT (See *Toward Rediscovering the Old Testament*, 164-66; and *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*). His following chart illustrates his usage of this paradigm.

**Introductory Lecture for 1 Corinthians**

**Gary T. Meadors, Th.D.**

**Practicing a Process of “Validation” in Biblical Study**

The term “validation” merely captures the process by which we validate competing interpretations of biblical texts. To validate views is merely to surface them from the literature base, to organize what they say, to compare what each claims to each other, and to categorize the views so that one can make reasoned judgments about their validity. **Validation is merely the process of research that provides the interpreter with the information they need to make reasoned decisions about the meaning of biblical passages.**

Anyone with access to sources (e.g. good commentaries) can do the basic work of validation (i.e. gathering information and logging it in a logical manner). The next level of the interpretive process is to make informed judgments about the meaning of texts from the information you surface. This aspect requires an understanding of the many aspects of interpretation that are classified as “hermeneutics” (which means the process of unpacking meaning from texts). **Hermeneutics is an activity**. It is an activity **performed from a skill base** that is directed by interpretive principles and methods.

Everyone who engages the material in these lectures on 1 Corinthians will make judgments about what the teacher presents. The question is how do you go about making those judgments? Is it merely some subjective process about how you feel about what the teacher claims? Or do you have a study process, like the Bereans in Acts 17:10-12, that probes what the Scripture actually teaches?

So “validation” is merely the process whereby you say, “Here are 5 views on this text that qualified biblical literature presents,” and then you systematically evaluate the claims of each in order to move toward what you think best represents an author’s teaching.

If you use “good” commentaries, you are watching validation at work. One good commentary series in English is The Word Biblical Commentary / WBC. This series covers both the OT and the NT and is available in traditional book form and electronically (e.g. the LOGOS program and the ACCORDANCE computer program both have this series available).

One good example in WBC is William Mounce on 1 Timothy 2:12, the famously disputed text on women/gender. Mounce begins his treatment (excerpt is taken from Accordance in location) with…

“The literature is voluminous, and within the scope of this commentary it is not possible to enter into the whole of the discussion. The ***differing interpretations***, however, will be

reviewed as they relate directly to the historical meaning of this text; to do more than this would place too great an emphasis on this one passage and detract from the PE corpus as a whole. For the best presentations of the ***complementarian interpretation*** of the text, see Köstenberger et al., eds., *Women in the Church* (hereafter referred to by the authors of individual articles), and the works by Piper and Grudem, Moo, Fung, Hurley, and Foh. For the ***egalitarian interpretation,*** see Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus,* and the works by Fee, Groothuis, Scholer (especially “1 Timothy 2:9–15 and the Place of Women in the Church’s Ministry”), Perriman, and Spencer. The interchange between Moo and Payne is especially helpful.

 I will try to stay away from antagonistic terms such as “clearly,” “obviously,” and “ignores,” and avoid accusing the other position of having an agenda (what position does not?), or any other tactic that might deteriorate into labeling and name calling. I will not call someone’s conclusion his or her assumption.

 ***If one position were truly clear or obvious, then there would not be significantly divergent positions held by respectable scholars***. As Scholer comments, “The concept of genuinely objective biblical interpretation is a myth. All interpretation is socially located, individually skewed, and ecclesiastically and theologically conditioned. . . . All biblical interpreters, regardless of where they now stand on the issue of women in ministry, have been deeply influenced by both the sexism and misogyny of our culture and also the currents of nineteenth-century women’s rights and twentieth-century feminist movements” (“1 Timothy 2:9–15,” 213–14). No labels can escape offending someone, and yet since labels are necessary “complementarian” will be used for the position that believes Paul sees some restrictions on women’s ministry, and “egalitarian” for the position that sees none.” [highlights and italics are mine]

When you read this quote carefully, you will see the “validation” indicators I have mentioned: different views on the text; literature/interpreters that represent those views; and the challenge of logging and working through the views. What you do not see in this brief quote is Mounce’s working through the phrases of this text which themselves need validation! This work provides an analysis of the ultimate claims of “large” views like the gender debate presents.

Mounce proceeds to lay out the issues in the context of 1 Tim 2:12 and the views that result. His exegetical work eventually feeds into the two major views he cites in his quotation (so there are actually several layers of validation going on…the text itself and then the theological views). Working through this kind of commentary is not for the faint hearted, neither is it for those who do not understand that doing ministry is based in knowing the Bible. But it is what is necessary if you claim to be a ministry leader. Do not fret about your skills or lack of them, but begin a life-long journey of developing your skills by doing this kind of reading/labor. Do not be satisfied with simplistic answers to difficult issues.

As we proceed through the book of 1 Corinthians, this model of validation will be surfaced on numerous occasions. Here is a template for one example of validation in relation to 1 Cor. 14:33b-36.

 **ILLUSTRATIVE EXERCISE IN VALIDATION**

 **The Problem of 1 Cor 14:33b-36**

**[The first task is to define the problem/issue being investigated. This will require adequate pre-research in order to understand and state what the problem is).**

Apparent Problem: 1 Cor 11 validates women's participation in the public services of the church. 1 Cor 14 seems to say the direct opposite--women are to be silent without exception and consult their husbands at home.

**[The second task is to “log” the various views on the text/s. Surfacing views is a research paper chase. When done right, you will always think, “If I could just find one more article or book, I might really nail this.” You will discover a lot of overlap in what is stated among sources. You use the multitude of sources to provide variety in source citations. All cited views must be supported by sources that *actually hold* the view cited…no secondary sources. That is, you cannot just find one book that lays out views and “trust” that it is adequate or fair. You must search as best you can for multiple sources.**

***Views Arguments Pro/Con***

1. Face value, and ignore

1 Cor 11. (popular literature) **[In this column you log the reasons**

 **a view presents for its position.**

2. Ch. 14 prophecy context = no **At this point, you DO NOT make**

authoritative teaching **judgments about the data, you**

(Hurley, Carson, et.al.) **merely log it as fairly as you can.]**

3. Interpolation (Conzelmann,

Fee, Payne)

4. Feminist's Pauline

Patriarchalism (Fiorenza)

5. Statement relates to family

codes and not to public

assembly (Ellis)

6. Response to Corinthian

Slogan (Kaiser, Talbert)

7. Pauline ironic sarcasm

(Allison)

**[The third task is to study the views you have surface in order to make judgments about which one/s best represents the “direct” teaching of the text. You will also have to make judgments about where a commentator deviates from the “direct” to the “implied” teaching and also where a “creative construct” has been created on their view of the data. ]**
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 **A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE CORINTHIAN EPISTLES**

**(Compiled by G. Meadors)**

**A. The City of Corinth**

 1. Geography (see map insert).

The city of Corinth is located on the **Isthmus** which connects northern Greece with the Peloponnesus. Corinth also had two seaports, Lechaeum to the west and Cenchreae to the east, which connected the Adriatic and Aegean seas (cf. Acts 18:18; Rom 16:1). In ancient days, Corinth served as the crossroads for merchants and travelers. In ancient times, ships would avoid the open seas of the southern tip of Greece and would unload their cargo in one port, cart it across the narrow part of the Isthmus, reload on another ship and be on their way. During this process, the mariners could have a good time in Corinth! This strategic location gave the city an international flavor and cultural openness. A canal was eventually built/finished in 1881-1893 (the 3 ½ mile modern canal).

Google offers many opportunities to become acquainted with the geography of ancient Corinth. Please surf through at least these two sites and become familiar with the geographical setting and ancient city of Corinth (e.g. the Agora = the ancient market place).

**(NOTE: You may have to type the http into your browser. If one doesn’t work or is “gone”, just google and you will find plenty of pictures and artifacts.)**

<http://www.bing.com/images/search?q=maps+of+ancient+Corinth&qpvt=maps+of+ancient+Corinth&FORM=IGRE>

<http://gbgm-umc.org/umw/corinthians/cityarch.stm>

 2. History

In 146 BCE Corinth resisted the expanding power of Rome and the city was reduced to ruins by the Roman general Mummius. Nearly one hundred years later Julius Caesar decided to rebuild Corinth as a Roman colony. By 44 BCE the city was repopulated and experienced phenomenal growth and became (27 BCE) the capital of the province of Achaia. By the time of Paul's visit (ca. 55 CE), Corinth was a busy crossroads city between Rome and Asia. Garland makes an important observations about this resettlement, this event “created a new Roman heritage for Corinth and gave it a different appearance from its Greek period” (see pp. 2-3). Winter’s research will show the significance of this observation for the exegesis of the Corinthian epistles.

 3. *Sitz im leben* (life situation).

Jerome Murphy-O’Connors’ *St. Paul's Corinth* provides a firsthand impression of the

historical and cultural nuances of the city of Corinth (see *ANRW* II.7.1). A difficult problem in reconstructing the *sitz im leben* of Corinth is to be careful to distinguish between the classical Corinth (8th century BCE to 146 BCE) and the Corinth of the NT period (44 BCE). The problem of reconstruction is also intensified because some of the record proceeds from writers in the rival city of Athens. Historical reconstruction must match the time frame of the desired reconstruction. For example, Aristophanes (Fragmenta, 354), a comic playwright, uses (coins?) a verb form of “Corinth,” (“Corinthianizer”), to render the idea "practice fornication." But the interpreter must be carful in his use of this reference to describe Paul's Corinth since Aristophanes wrote during the 5-4th century BCE and was a pro-Athenian author (cf. Murphy-O’Connor, 56).

Another problem of *sitz im leben* reconstruction has to do with the nature of the Aphrodite (Venus) cult in Corinth. Strabo writes about Corinth as a city of love with the temple of Aphrodite sporting one thousand temple prostitutes. Here again, the ancient context must be evaluated. Murphy-O'Connor has correctly observed that "many New Testament introductions and commentaries have stressed this aspect because it appears to provide an explanation for the attention that Paul was obliged to give to sexual problems in 1 Cor 5-7. However, the context clearly indicates that Strabo is here referring to the pre 146 B.C. city and not to the newly constituted Roman colony that he visited in 29 BCE. At that time he saw only a 'small temple of Aphrodite' (ibid., 21b); the same adjective would apply to the two that Pausanias mentions (ibid., 28 and 39). The excavations have not revealed any temple of Aphrodite of any period capable of accommodating the numbers mentioned here" (ibid., 55).

It is interesting that a broken top door jam stone inscription reading [ΣΥΝΑ]ΓΩΓΗ ΕΒΡ[ΑΙΩΝ] (= “Synagogue of the Hebrews”) was discovered in Corinth, thus confirming a Jewish presence (cf. also Philo's inclusion of Corinth in his list of the diaspora in *Leg. Gaj.*, 281f.).

Another noteworthy observation is that Paul wrote Romans 1:18-32 while at Corinth. Therefore, while the degrading descriptions of ancient Corinth should not be freely transferred to revived Corinth, Corinth was still a cosmopolitan Greek city and evidenced a morality which is in stark contrast to biblical morality.

 4. It was a Roman World

The Bible was not written in a vacuum.

* It addressed the world of its time within the historical, cultural and literary conventions of its own time.
* Epistles are letters and are “occasional literature.” That is, they are written to people and churches because of issues (occasions) that have surfaced.
* One cannot get their arms around 1 Corinthians without some understanding of the ROMAN world. While Alexander the Great created “Hellenism” and the 1st Century geography, by the time of the Apostles it was a ROMAN world.
* Knowing classical Greek history and culture is helpful, but that was not the context of the Corinthians every day life. ROMAN culture, conventions, law, and values dominated the background of the people to whom Paul writes.
* Rome did absorb the Greek world it conquered and we should expect aspects of Hellenism to appear, but the structures of the Roman world and especially is colonies, were stamped with Rome’s worldview.
* It is the responsibility of commentaries to inform students of the Bible about the world of the NT. It is the student’s responsibility to read and read widely.

David Garland (*1 Corinthians*. BECNT. Baker, 2003, 3-13) briefly highlights the Roman heritage of the resettled (44 BC) Roman colony of Corinth. See Strabo, *Geographica* 8.6.23; 17.3.15, for an overview of Julius Caesar colonization of Corinth.

* **Social Relations**
	+ Colonies were founded “to foster the majesty of Roman culture, religion, and values.”
	+ It was a “mercantile society” with those of “social status” in control. There was a viciousness in the competition to achieve the status (*dignitas*) one thought they were due.
	+ The values spawned “were antithetical to the message of the cross—particularly those related to honor and status so basic to the Greco-roman social system in which power manifesting itself in ruthlessness and self-advancement is thought to be the only sensible course….” (Garland, 5). This “competition” surfaces in 1 Cor as one of Paul’s challenges. “The Christian community had become simply another arena to compete for status according to the societal norms.” (Garland, 6).
	+ So the world of 1 Corinthians reflects a Church that had drunk deeply from the well of
		- individualism
		- power produces status
		- the “spirit of the world” = “the wisdom of the world”
		- status created “haves” and “have-nots”
		- sexual abuse on the basis of status
		- rigged courts for the favor of those with status
	+ Paul seeks to transform the Corinthians from Roman/”worldly” values to biblical values.
* **Religious Context**
	+ As with most Greco-Roman cities, Corinth was polytheistic to the core. Besides all the typical gods, there was “The Imperial Cult”, “an alliance of throne and altar forged by [Caesar] Augustus” (Garland, 9).
	+ It was a “cafeteria line of religious practices,” “…the more gods that one appeased and had on one’s side, the better.” (Garland, 9). Albeit very different, Corinth and Athens were rival cities. Because of the

pluralistic culture, Rome did not “police” religious activity unless it was creating problems for Roman rule, and especially the “welfare of the city.” READ Acts 17 and Romans 1:18-32 in order to get a feel for this 1st Century context.

* + Christianity’s exclusivism did not float well in their culture.
		- Because they did not promote polytheism, they were viewed as “atheists”!
		- Because “the City” was framed in polytheistic festivals for the good of the City, Christians were viewed as “impious” and even “haters of humankind” for their non-participation.
		- “Paul’s proclamation that Jesus alone is Lord (8:5-6) directly challenged the imperial cult.” (Garland, 11).

**B. Images of Ancient Corinth**

Surfing the net for useful material (sites come and go, so if the links are gone, find your own).

The following material will lead your to observe images from ancient Corinth and provide you with some translated primary source descriptions of ancient Corinth. Some of this material describes the pre-Paul era and one will have to distinguish the periods represented for further research.

 Images … sites:

<http://www.bibleplaces.com/corinth.htm>

<http://www.planetware.com/pictures-/corinth-ancient-corinth-gr-pel-acor.htm>

<http://www.grisel.net/corinth.htm>

<http://www.bibleplaces.com/corinth.htm>

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/artifact?name=Corinth&object=Site&redirect=true>

**SLIDES 1-31 (Under Lessons Tab Week 1)**

Alexander the Great slideshow (AUDIO under Week 1 Lessons tab)

**SLIDES 32-64 (See descriptions for slides below)**

Images of Ancient Corinth

The slides and notes for this section are take from <http://www.abu.nb.ca/courses/pauline/images/Corinth1.htm> (8 slides) with slight emendations and from Accordance Bible Software, Photo Guide 3 (which are also the remaining Corinth slides). The slides are integrated since there was some overlap.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **“Corinth (ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ *Korinthos*).** Located on the west end of the isthmus connecting mainland Greece with the Peloponnesus, Corinth benefited from the trade between northern and southern Greece, as well as from the Mediterranean sea-trade. It was therefore an extremely wealthy and cosmopolitan city. It had a reputation for sexual immorality, owing in part to its prominent temple to Aphrodite. In Roman times, it became the capital of the province of Achaia.Paul visited the city during his second missionary journey, and remained there for a year and a half (Acts 18:1-18). It was there that he first met Priscilla and Aquila. Apollos also taught in Corinth some time after Paul’s departure (Acts 18:27-19:1). Paul wrote at least two letters to the Corinthian church (1 Corinthians 1:2; 2 Corinthians 2:1) in which he chastised them for their factions and immorality, and encouraged them to live in unity and in accordance with sound teaching.”**(from Accordance)** | “The city of Corinth was situated on the Isthmus of Corinth, which joined the Peloponnesus to the mainland of Greece.  In 146 BCE, because of its rebellion against Rome, the Roman general L. Mummius completely destroyed the city, leveling it. The site remained uninhabited for a century, when the city was refounded as a Roman colony in 46 BCE by Julius Caesar; the name of the city was Laus Iulia Corinthus ("Corinth, the praise of Julius") [Garland’s note of the official name: *Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis*, “Colony of Corinth in Honor of Julius,” is probably more correct]. Corinth became a major center of commerce in the Roman province of Achaia. Strabo explains the commercial advantage of the city, "Corinth is called 'wealthy' because of its commerce, since it is situated on the Isthmus and is master of two harbors, of which the one leads straight to Asia, and the other to Italy; and it makes easy the exchange of merchandise from both countries that are so far distant from each other" (Geography, 8.6.20). In 29 BCE, Corinth was chosen as the administrative capital of the province, the seat of the Roman proconsul.  The population of the city was Roman, Greek and other peoples, including Jews.”**(from ABU website)** |

See inserted map.

OBSERVE the POWERPOINT slide show #s32 and following on images of ancient Corinth with the following descriptions.

**Slide 32** Panoramic view of the city of Corinth. Taken from atop the Acrocorinth (see Figure 14), this photograph shows the modern city of Corinth encircling the ruins of the ancient city (center). In the background we see the Corinthian gulf, which empties into the Mediterranean Sea on the west side of Greece.

**Slides 33 and 34:** The Ruins of Ancient Corinth. The complex tangle of ruins at Corinth testifies to the fact that this was once a large and thriving city with numerous shops, temples, and public buildings.

**Slide 35** Acrocorinth: “Dominating the landscape at Corinth is the acrocorinth. On the higher of the twin peaks of the acrocorinth is found the remnants of the Temple of Aphrodite, which had thrived during the classical period, but had fallen into ruins by time of the city's refounding.”

**Slide 36** The entrance to the Acrocorinth. The Acrocorinth is most approachable from the west side, which is defended by three gates. The lowest of these was built by the Turks; the middle, by the Franks; and the highest, by the Byzantines. The Acrocorinth was able to withstand lengthy sieges because of the presence of a spring near the summit.

**Slide 37** The city of Corinth, as seen from atop the Acro-Corinth. The Temple of Apollo is visible at left, with the three remaining columns of the Temple of Octavia (see Figure 6) just below it. Near the center of the photograph are the remains of the northwest stoa of the Agora (see Figure 8).

**Slide 38** The Lechaion Road: “The marbled-paved Lechaion Road connected Corinth with the port of Lechaion on the Corinthian Gulf to the north.”

**Slide 39** The Lechaion Way at Corinth. This marble-paved road linked the city of Corinth with its northwestern port of Lechaion. The stairway at its end led up to an imposing propylaion, or gateway, which in turn gave access to the agora, or marketplace.

**Slide 40 Roman Roads (Accordance Map feature)**

**Inscriptions at Corinth.**

**Slide 41:** Latin Inscriptions on the ruins of ancient Corinth. The Romans destroyed the Greek city-state of Corinth in 146 B.C., and eventually rebuilt it as a Roman colony, a fact which is attested by the large number of Latin inscriptions among the ruins.

**Slide 42** The Erastus Inscription: “In 1929, among the excavated ruins of ancient Corinth was discovered an inscription on a marble paving stone bearing the name of Erastus. The inscription read: **ERASTVS. PRO. AED. S. P. STRAVIT**, which is an abbreviation of **ERASTUS PRO AEDILITATE SUA PECUNIA STRAVIT**. The inscription translates as "Erastus, in return for his aedileship, laid this pavement at his own expense." The office of aedilis was the commissioner of public works and, for this reason, a high ranking public offical belonging to the Roman ruling class in a city. Paul mentions an Erastus from Corinth in his Letter to the Romans (16:23) and identifies him as "the city treasurer" (oikonomos), which is ***not*** the Greek equivalent of the Latin aedilis; rather the oikonomos is equivalent to the lesser office of arcarius. If the Erastus of Rom 16:23 is to be identified with the man of the inscription, then he was aedilis either before or after Paul wrote his letter. (See Bruce, Romans, 266.)”

**Slide 43** is an inscription that mentions Erastus, a name that appears several times in the New Testament (Acts 19:22; Romans 16:23; 2 Timothy 4:20). This inscription describes Erastus as an *aedile*, a position which almost certainly is synonymous with the term οἰκονόμος (*oikonomos*) translated as “city treasurer” in Romans 16:23. Since the epistle to the Romans was almost certainly written from Corinth, then the Erastus in this inscription could well be the same person.

**Slide 44** Lintel of Synagogue at Corinth: “On the Lechaion Road at the foot the steps leading to the proplyon, was discovered in 1898 what appears to be the lintel of the doorway into the synagogue at Corinth. The inscription on the lintel reads, "The Synagogue of the Hebrews," and possibly dates from the time of Paul's visits to Corinth. Since the lintel is quite heavy it is probable that the synagogue was situated in the vicinity in which it was discovered, which means that the synagogue was on or near the Lechaion Road not far from the agora. Titius Justus's house was somewhere nearby (Acts 18:7).”

**Slide 45** A close up of the inscription from the remains of the synagogue in Corinth. It reads either [ΣΥΝΑ]ΓΩΓΗ ΕΒΡ[ΑΙΩΝ], “Synagogue of Hebrews” or [ΣΥΝΑ]ΓΩΓΗ ΕΒΡ[ΑΙΚΟΣ], “Hebrew Synagogue.” This inscription is from a period later than the New Testament, but [probably] testifies to the presence of a Jewish community in Corinth as mentioned in Acts 18:4.

**Slide 46** Temple of Apollo: “The Doric Temple of Apollo was built in 550 BCE. The re-founded Roman city of Corinth was situated to the south of the temple.”

**Slide 47:** The Temple of Apollo at Corinth. One of the oldest stone temples in Greece, the Temple of Apollo was completed in 550 B.C. Only seven of its 38 limestone columns remain, each one carved out of a single block of stone.

**Slide 48:** The Temple of Apollo at Corinth. The massive Doric columns of the Temple of Apollo rise to a height of 24 feet. In the background, about two miles from the main city, rises the Acrocorinth, a steep cliff which was used both as a fortress and as a cultic center. At its northeast summit stood the ancient Temple of Aphrodite, which, according to one ancient writer, was attended by 1,000 sacred prostitutes.

**Slide 49:** The Temple of Octavia at Corinth. These elaborate Corinthian columns probably formed part of the enclosure of the Roman temple dedicated to Octavia, the sister of Augustus.

**Slides 50 & 51:** The Asclepieion at Corinth. The Sanctuary of Asclepius, the Greek god of healing, was situated at the outskirts of Corinth near a refreshing spring. The sanctuary consisted of a temple with an adjoining courtyard and three large dining rooms.
Figure 14 shows a diagram of the dining facilities of the Asclepieion. These dining rooms were used in connection with religious festivals, but may also have been used for private parties, weddings, and other celebrations. The Asclepieion may also have been a popular place for wealthy Corinthians to go to enjoy a meal away from the hustle and bustle of the main city. Paul may have had the dining facilities of this pagan sanctuary in view when he wrote to the Corinthians about eating meat sacrificed to idols (1 Corinthians 8:4-13; see especially verse 10).

**Slide 52** The βημα at Corinth: “The *bema* was situated in the agora.  It served as the platform on which Roman officials stood when making public appearances.  While in Corinth, Paul was dragged before the proconsul Gallio, and was accused of  "persuading people to worship God in ways contrary to the law" (Acts 18:12-17).”

**Slides 53 & 54:** The *Bema* at Corinth. The *bema*, or speaker’s platform, was located in the center of the agora. It was from here that public proclamations were read, and here that the city magistrates sat to judge cases. Some Corinthian Jews brought Paul to the *bema* and accused him of teaching heresies, but their case was thrown out of court (Acts 18:12-18).

**Slides 55 & 56:** Paved causeway near Corinth. In order to avoid rounding the stormy and dangerous cape at the southernmost point of the Pelopponese, ancient ships would put in at one of Corinth’s ports, unload, and be dragged along the *diolkos*, a paved causeway which stretched the four miles across the isthmus. This causeway was used from ancient times until the canal shown in Figure 21 was completed.

**Slide 57** The *diolkos*: “Ships were transported across the Isthmus of Corinth  by means of the diolkos, a stone-paved access linking the ports of Cenchraea to Lechaion.  Ships were put on sleds and rolled on logs along the diolkos.”

**Slide 58** The Corinth Canal. The present canal was begun by Nero in the first century A.D., but was not completed until 1893. Before this canal was completed, ships were dragged along the *diolkos*, a paved causeway (see Figures 22 and 23).

**Slide 59** The Peirene Fountain: “Pausanias describes the Peirene fountain as follows: "On leaving the market-place (agora) along the road to Lechaeum you come to a gateway, on which are two gilded chariots, one carrying Phaethon the son of Helius (Sun), the other Helius himself.  A little farther away from the gateway, on the right as you go in, is a bronze Heracles.  After this is the entrance to the water of Peirene.  The legend about Peirene is that she was a woman who became a spring because of her tears shed in lamentation for her son Cenchrias, who was unintentionally killed by Artemis.  The spring is ornamented with white marble, and there have been made chambers like caves, out of which the water flows into an open-air well.  It is pleasant to drink, and they say that the Corinthian bronze, when red-hot, is tempered by this water, since bronze [    ] the Corinthians have not.  Moreover near Peirene are an image and a sacred enclosure of Apollo; in the latter is a painting of the exploit of Odysseus against the suitors.”

**Slide 60:** A close up of the Peirene Fountain at Corinth. The water of the Peirene spring could be accessed through any of the alcoves in this monumental façade.

**Slide 61:** The Agora, or marketplace, of Corinth. The northwest stoa of the agora contained a series of small shops such as this one.

**Slide 62:** Probable location of the meat market at Corinth. Its presence is testified by two Latin inscriptions that have been found referring to a *macellum*, which directly

corresponds to the Greek word μάκελλον (*makellon*) used in 1 Corinthians 10:25. This meat market may also be associated with the issue about eating meat sacrificed to idols (1 Corinthians 8:4-13).

**Slide 63:** Remains of a theatre at Corinth.

**Slide 64:** Echoes of the Apostle Paul. A plaque on the side of a Corinthian church records the “apostolic succession” of bishops at Corinth, beginning with the apostle Paul and his contemporaries, Apollos, Silas, and Sosthenes.

**Slides 65 to 74 provide images of “head coverings” for men and women. These will be discussed in 1 Cor . 11.**

**LITERARY TEXTS FROM PRIMARY SOURCES….**

This ABU website material also provides descriptions of Corinth from Strabo and Pausanias. These two ancient authors produced “tour book” accounts for their era.

**THE FOLLOWING IS AN EXCERPT FROM**

**Strabo, Geography, 8.6.20-23**

**(Late 1st Century BCE-Early 1st Century)**

**The Wealth of Corinth**

[8.6.20] Corinth is called "wealthy" because of its commerce, since it is situated on the Isthmus and is master of two harbors, of which the one leads straight to Asia, and the other to Italy; and it makes easy the exchange of merchandise from both countries that are so far distant from each other.  And just as in early times the Strait of Sicily was not easy to navigate, so also the high seas, and particularly the sea beyond Maleae, were not, on account of the contrary winds; and hence the proverb, "But when you double Maleae, forget your home."  At any rate, it was a welcome alternative, for the merchants both from Italy and from Asia, to avoid the voyage to Maleae and to land their cargoes here. And also the duties on what by land was exported from the Peloponnesus and what was imported to it fell to those who held the keys.  And to later times this remained ever so. But to the Corinthians of later times still greater advantages were added, for also the Isthmian Games, which were celebrated there, were wont to draw crowds of people.

**The Early History of Corinth**

And the Bacchiadae, a rich and numerous and illustrious family, became tyrants of Corinth, and held their empire for nearly two hundred years, and without disturbance reaped the fruits of the commerce; and when Cypselus overthrew these, he himself became tyrant, and his house endured for three generations; and an evidence of the wealth of this house is the offering which Cypselus dedicated at Olympia, a huge statue of beaten gold.  Again, Demaratus, one of the men who had been in power at Corinth, fleeing from the seditions there, carried with him so much wealth from his home to

Tyrrhenia that not only he himself became the ruler of the city that admitted him, but his son was made king of the Romans.

**The Cult of Aphrodite**

And the temple of Aphrodite was so rich that it owned more than a thousand temple slaves, courtesans, whom both men and women had dedicated to the goddess.  And therefore it was also on account of these women that the city was crowded with people and grew rich; for instance, the ship captains freely squandered their money, and hence the proverb, "Not for every man is the voyage to Corinth."  Moreover, it is recorded that a certain courtesan said to the woman who reproached her with the charge that she did not like to work or touch wool:  "Yet, such as I am, in this short time I have taken down three webs."

**Description of Corinth**

[8.6.21] The situation of the city, as described by Hieronymus and Eudoxus and others, and from what I myself saw after the recent restoration of the city by the Romans, is about as follows:  A lofty mountain with a perpendicular height of three stadia and one half, and an ascent of as much as thirty stadia, ends in a sharp peak; it is called Acrocorinthus, and its northern side is the steepest; and beneath it lies the city in a level, trapezium-shaped place close to the very base of the Acrocorinthus.  Now the circuit of the city itself used to be as much as forty stadia, and all of it that was unprotected by the mountain was enclosed by a wall; and even the mountain itself, the Acrocorinthus, used to be comprehended within the circuit of this wall wherever wall-building was possible, and when I went up the mountain the ruins of the encircling wall were plainly visible. And so the whole perimeter amounted to about eighty-five stadia.  On its other sides the mountain is less steep, though here too it rises to a considerable height and is conspicuous all round.

**The Summit of the Acrocorinth**

Now the summit has a small temple of Aphrodite; and below the summit is the spring Peirene, which, although it has no overflow, is always full of transparent, potable water.  And they say that the spring at the base of the mountain is the joint result of pressure from this and other subterranean veins of water--a spring which flows out into the city in such quantity that it affords a fairly large supply of water.  And there is a good supply of wells throughout the city, as also, they say, on the Acrocorinthus; but I myself did not see the latter wells. At any rate, when Euripides says, "I am come, having left Acrocorinthus that is washed on all sides, the sacred hill-city of Aphrodite," one should take "washed on all sides" as meaning in the depths of the mountain, since wells and subterranean pools extend through it, or else should assume that in early times Peirene was wont to rise over the surface and flow down the sides of the mountain.  And here, they say, Pegasus, a winged horse which sprang from the neck of the Gorgon Medusa when her head was cut off, was caught while drinking by Bellerophon.  And the same horse, it is said, caused Hippucrene to spring up on Helicon when he struck with his hoof the rock that lay below that mountain.  And at the foot of Peirene is the Sisypheium, which preserves no inconsiderable ruins of a certain temple, or royal palace, made of white marble.

**View from the Acrocorinth**

And from the summit, looking towards the north, one can view Parnassus and Helicon--lofty, snow-clad mountains--and the Crisaean Gulf, which lies at the foot of the two mountains and is surrounded by Phocis, Boeotia, and Megaris, and by the parts of Corinthia and Sicyonia which lie across the gulf opposite to Phocis, that is, towards the west.  And above all these countries lie the Oneian Mountains, as they are called, which extend as far as Boeotia and Cithaeron from the Sceironian Rocks, that is, from the road that leads along these rocks towards Attica.

**The Harbors of Corinth**

[8.6.22] The beginning of the seaboard on the two sides is, on the one side, Lechaeum, and, on the other, Cenchreae, a village and a harbor distant about seventy stadia from Corinth.  Now this latter they use for the trade from Asia, but Lechaeum for that from Italy. Lechaeum lies beneath the city, and does not contain many residences; but long walls about twelve stadia in length have been built on both sides of the road that leads to Lechaeum.

**Description of the Isthmus**

The shore that extends from here to Pagae in Megaris is washed by the Corinthian Gulf; it is concave, and with the shore on the other side, at Schoenus, which is near Cenchreae, it forms the "Diolcus."  In the interval between Lechaeum and Pagae there used to be, in early times, the oracle of the Acraean Hera; and here, too, is Olmiae, the promontory that forms the gulf in which are situated Oenoe and Pagae, the latter a stronghold of the Megarians and Oenoe of the Corinthians.  From Cenchreae one comes to Schoenus, where is the narrow part of the isthmus, I mean the "Diolcus"; and then one comes to Crommyonia.  Off this shore lie the Saronic and Eleusinian Gulfs, which in a way are the same, and border on the Hermionic Gulf.  On the Isthmus is also the temple of the Isthmian Poseidon, in the shade of a grove of pinetrees, where the Corinthians used to celebrate the Isthmian Games.  Crommyon is a village in Corinthia, though in earlier times it was in Megaris; and in it is laid the scene of the myth of the Crommyonian sow, which, it is said, was the mother of the Caledonian boar; and, according to tradition, the destruction of this sow was one of the labors of Theseus.

**The City of Tenea**

Tenea, also, is in Corinthia, and in it is a temple of the Teneatan Apollo; and it is said that most of the colonists who accompanied Archias, the leader of the colonists to Syracuse, set out from there, and that afterwards Tenea prospered more than the other settlements, and finally even had a government of its own, and, revolting from the Corinthians, joined the Romans, and endured after the destruction of Corinth. And mention is also made of an oracle that was given to a certain man from Asia, who enquired whether it was better to change his home to Corinth: "Blest is Corinth, but Tenea for me."  But in ignorance some pervert this as follows: "but Tegea for me!"  And it is said that Polybus reared Oedipus here. And it seems, also, that there is a kinship between the peoples of Tenedos and Tenea, through Tennes the son of Cycnus, as Aristotle says; and the similarity in the worship of Apollo among the two peoples affords strong indications of such kinship.

**The Fall of Corinth**

[8.6.23] The Corinthians, when they were subject to Philip, not only sided with him in his quarrel with the Romans, but individually behaved so contemptuously towards the Romans that certain persons ventured to pour down filth upon the Roman ambassadors when passing by their house. For this and other offences, however, they soon paid the penalty, for a considerable army was sent thither, and the city itself was razed to the ground by Leucius Mummius; and the other countries as far as Macedonia became subject to the Romans, different commanders being sent into different countries; but the Sicyonians obtained most of the Corinthian country.

**The Plundering of Corinth**

Polybius, who speaks in a tone of pity of the events connected with the capture of Corinth, goes on to speak of the disregard shown by the army for the works of art and votive offerings; for he says that he was present and saw paintings that had been flung to the ground and saw the soldiers playing dice on these.  Among the paintings he names that of Dionysus by Aristeides, to which, according to some writers, the saying, "Nothing in comparison with the Dionysus," referred; and also the painting of Heracles in torture in the robe of Deianeira.  Now I have not seen the latter, but I saw the Dionysus, a most beautiful work, on the walls of the temple of Ceres in Rome; but when recently the temple was burned, the painting perished with it. And I may almost say that the most and best of the other dedicatory offerings at Rome came from there; and the cities in the neighborhood of Rome also obtained some; for Mummius, being magnanimous rather than fond of art, as they say, readily shared with those who asked.  And when Leucullus built the Temple of Good Fortune and a portico, he asked Mummius for the use of the statues which he had, saying that he would adorn the temple with them until the dedication and then give them back.  However, he did not give them back, but dedicated them to the goddess, and then bade Mummius to take them away if he wished.  But Mummius took it lightly, for he cared nothing about them, so that he gained more repute than the man who dedicated them.

**The Refounding of Corinth**

Now after Corinth had remained deserted for a long time, it was restored again, because of its favorable position, by the deified Caesar, who colonized it with people that belonged for the most part to the freedmen class. And when these were removing the ruins and at the same time digging open the graves, they found numbers of terra-cotta reliefs, and also many bronze vessels.  And since they admired the workmanship they left no grave unransacked; so that, well supplied with such things and disposing of them at a high price, they filled Rome with Corinthian "mortuaries," for thus they called the things taken from the graves, and in particular the earthenware.  Now at the outset the earthenware was very highly prized, like the bronzes of Corinthian workmanship, but later they ceased to care much for them, since the supply of earthen vessels failed and most of them were not even well executed.

**Conclusion**

The city of the Corinthians, then, was always great and wealthy, and it was well equipped with men skilled both in the affairs of state and in the craftsman's arts; for both here and in Sicyon the arts of painting and modeling and all such arts of the craftsman flourished most. The city had territory, however, that was not very fertile, but rifted and rough; and from this fact all have called Corinth "beetling," and use the proverb, "Corinth is both beetle-browed and full of hollows."

**THE FOLLOWING IS AN EXCERPT FROM**

**Pausanias, Greece, 2.1.1.-5.1 (2nd Century)**

**Introduction**

[2.1.1] The Corinthian land is a portion of the Argive, and is named after Corinthus. That Corinthus was a son of Zeus I have never known anybody say seriously except the majority of the Corinthians.  Eumelus, the son of Amphilytus, of the family called Bacchidae, who is said to have composed the epic poem, says in his Corinthian History (if indeed the history be his) that Ephyra, the daughter of Oceanus, dwelt first in this land; that afterwards Marathon, the son of Epopeus, the son of Aloeus, the son of Helius (Sun), fleeing from the lawless violence of his father migrated to the sea coast of Attica; that on the death of Epopeus he came to Peloponnesus, divided his kingdom among his sons, and returned to Attica; and that Asopia was renamed after Sicyon, and Ephyraea after Corinthus. 2.1.2] Corinth is no longer inhabited by any of the old Corinthians, but by colonists sent out by the Romans.  This change is due to the Achaean League.  The Corinthians, being members of it, joined in the war against the Romans, which Critolaus, when appointed general of the Achaeans, brought about by persuading to revolt both the Achaeans and the majority of the Greeks outside the Peloponnesus. When the Romans won the war, they carried out a general disarmament of the Greeks and dismantled the walls of such cities as were fortified. Corinth was laid waste by Mummius, who at that time commanded the Romans in the field, and it is said that it was afterwards refounded by Caesar, who was the author of the present constitution of Rome.  Carthage, too, they say, was refounded in his reign.

**The Isthmus**

[2.1.3] In the Corinthian territory is also the place called Cromyon from Cromus the son of Poseidon.  Here they say that Phaea was bred; overcoming this sow was one of the traditional achievements of Theseus. Farther on the pine still grew by the shore at the time of my visit, and there was an altar of Melicertes.  At this place, they say, the boy was brought ashore by a dolphin; Sisyphus found him lying and gave him burial on the Isthmus, establishing the Isthmian games in his honor. [2.1.4] At the beginning of the Isthmus is the place where the brigand Sinis used to take hold of pine trees and draw them down.  All those whom he overcame in fight he used to tie to the trees, and then allow them to swing up again. hereupon each of the pines used to drag to itself the bound man, and as the bond gave way in neither direction but was stretched equally in both, he was torn in two.  his was the way in which Sinis himself was slain by Theseus.  or

Theseus rid of evildoers the road from Troezen to Athens, killing those whom I have enumerated and, in sacred Epidaurus, Periphetes, thought to be the son f Hephaestus, who used to fight with a bronze club. [2.1.5] The Corinthian Isthmus stretches on the one hand to the sea at Cenchreae, and on the other to the sea at Lechaeum.  For this is what makes the region to the south mainland. He who tried to make the Peloponnesus an island gave up before digging through the Isthmus. Where they began to dig is still to be seen, but into the rock they did not advance at all. So it still is mainland as its nature is to be.  Alexander the son of Philip wished to dig through Mimas, and his attempt to do this was his only unsuccessful project.  The Cnidians began to dig through their isthmus, but the Pythian priestess stopped them.  So difficult it is for man to alter by violence what Heaven has made. [2.1.6] A legend of the Corinthians about their land is not peculiar to them, for I believe that the Athenians were the first to relate a similar story to glorify Attica. The Corinthians say that Poseidon had a dispute with Helius (Sun) about the land, and that Briareos arbitrated between them, assigning to Poseidon the Isthmus and the parts adjoining, and giving to Helius the height above the city.  Ever since, they say, the Isthmus has belonged to Poseidon.

**The Temple of Poseidon at Isthmia**

[2.1.7]  Worth seeing here are a theater and a white-marble race-course. Within the sanctuary of the god stand on the one side portrait statues of athletes who have won victories at the Isthmian games, on the other side pine trees growing in a row, the greater number of them rising up straight.  On the temple, which is not very large, stand bronze Tritons.  In the fore-temple are images, two of Poseidon, a third of Amphitrite, and a Sea, which also is of bronze.  The offerings inside were dedicated in our time by Herodes the Athenian, four horses, gilded except for the hoofs, which are of ivory, [2.1.8] and two gold Tritons beside the horses, with the parts below the waist of ivory.  On the car stand Amphitrite and Poseidon, and there is the boy Palaemon upright upon a dolphin.  These too are made of ivory and gold.  On the middle of the base on
 which the car is has been wrought a Sea holding up the young Aphrodite, and on either side are the nymphs called Nereids.  I know that there are altars to these in other parts of Greece, and that some Greeks have even dedicated to them precincts by shores, where honors are also paid to Achilles.  In Gabala is a holy sanctuary of Doto, where there was still remaining the robe by which the Greeks say that Eriphyle was bribed to wrong her son Alcmaeon. [2.1.9] Among the reliefs on the base of the statue of Poseidon are the sons of Tyndareus, because these too are saviours of ships and of sea-faring men.  The other offerings are images of Calm and of Sea, a horse like a whale from the breast onward, Ino and Bellerophontes, and the horse Pegasus.
[2.2.1] Within the enclosure is on the left a temple of Palaemon, with images in it of Poseidon, Leucothea and Palaemon himself. There is also what is called his Holy of Holies, and an underground descent to it, where they say that Palaemon is concealed.  Whosoever, whether Corinthian or stranger, swears falsely here, can by no means escape from his oath. There is also an ancient sanctuary called the altar of the Cyclopes, and they sacrifice to the Cyclopes upon it.

**The Isthmian Games**

[2.2.2] The graves of Sisyphus and of Neleus--for they say that Neleus came to Corinth, died of disease, and was buried near the Isthmus--I do not think that anyone would look for after reading Eumelus.  For he says that not even to Nestor did Sisyphus show the tomb of Neleus, because it must be kept unknown to everybody alike, and that Sisyphus is indeed buried on the Isthmus, but that few Corinthians, even those of his own day, knew where the grave was.  The Isthmian games were not interrupted even when Corinth had been laid waste by Mummius, but so long as it lay deserted the celebration of the games was entrusted to the Sicyonians, and when it was rebuilt the honor was restored to the present inhabitants.

**The Harbors of Corinth**

[2.2.3] The names of the Corinthian harbors were given them by Leches and Cenchrias, said to be the children of Poseidon and Peirene the daughter of Achelous, though in the poem called The Great Eoeae Peirene is said to be a daughter of Oebalus.  In Lechaeum are a sanctuary and a bronze image of Poseidon, and on the road leading from the Isthmus to Cenchreae a temple and ancient wooden image of Artemis. In Cenchreae are a temple and a stone statue of Aphrodite, after it on the mole running into the sea a bronze image of Poseidon, and at the other end of the harbor sanctuaries of Asclepius and of Isis.  Right opposite Cenchreae is Helen's Bath.  It is a large stream of salt, tepid water, flowing from a rock into the sea.

**The Road fron Cenchraea to Corinth**

[2.2.4]  As one goes up to Corinth are tombs, and by the gate is buried Diogenes of Sinope, whom the Greeks surname the Dog.  Before the city is a grove of cypresses called Craneum.  Here are a precinct of Bellerophontes, a temple of Aphrodite Melaenis and the grave of Lais, upon which is set a lioness holding a ram in her fore-paws. [2.2.5] There is in Thessaly another tomb which claims to be that of Lais, for she went to that country also when she fell in love with Hippostratus.  The story is that originally she was of Hycara in Sicily.  Taken captive while yet a girl by Nicias and the Athenians, she was sold and brought to Corinth, where she surpassed in beauty the courtesans of her time, and so won the admiration of the Corinthians that even now they claim Lais as their own.

**The Agora at Corinth**

[2.2.6] The things worthy of mention in the city include the extant remains of antiquity, but the greater number of them belong to the period of its second ascendancy.  On the market-place (agora), where most of the sanctuaries are, stand Artemis surnamed Ephesian and wooden images of Dionysus, which are covered with gold with the exception of their faces; these are ornamented with red paint. They are called Lysius and Baccheus, [2.2.7] and I too give the story told about them. They say that Pentheus treated Dionysus despitefully, his crowning outrage being that he went to Cithaeron, to spy upon the women, and climbing up a tree beheld what was done.  When the women detected Pentheus, they immediately dragged him down, and joined in tearing him, living as he was, limb from limb.  Afterwards, as the Corinthians say, the Pythian priestess commanded them by an oracle to discover that tree and to worship it equally with the god. For this reason they have made these images from the tree. [2.2.8] There is also a

temple of Fortune, with a standing image of Parian marble. Beside it is a sanctuary for all the gods.  Hard by is built a fountain, on which is a bronze Poseidon; under the feet of Poseidon is a dolphin spouting water.  There is also a bronze Apollo surnamed Clarius and a statue of Aphrodite made by Hermogenes of Cythera.  There are two bronze, standing images of Hermes, for one of which a temple has been made.  The images of Zeus also are in the open; one had not a surname, another they call Chthonius (of the Lower World) and the third Most High. [2.3.1] In the middle of the market-place (agora) is a bronze Athena, on the pedestal of which are wrought in relief figures of the Muses. Above the market-place (agora) is a temple of Octavia the sister of Augustus, who was emperor of the Romans after Caesar, the founder of the modern Corinth.

**The Road to Lechaeum**

[2.3.2]  On leaving the market-place (agora) along the road to Lechaeum you come to a gateway, on which are two gilded chariots, one carrying Phaethon the son of Helius (Sun), the other Helius himself.  A little farther away from the gateway, on the right as you go in, is a bronze Heracles.  After this is the entrance to the water of Peirene.  The legend about Peirene is that she was a woman who became a spring because of her tears shed in lamentation for her son Cenchrias, who was unintentionally killed by Artemis. [2.3.3] The spring is ornamented with white marble, and there have been made chambers like caves, out of which the water flows into an open-air well.  It is pleasant to drink, and they say that the Corinthian bronze, when red-hot, is tempered by this water, since bronze [    ] the Corinthians have not.  Moreover near Peirene are an image and a sacred enclosure of Apollo; in the latter is a painting of the exploit of Odysseus against the suitors. [2.3.4] Proceeding on the direct road to Lechaeum we see a bronze image of a seated Hermes.  By him stands a ram, for Hermes is the god who is thought most to care for and to increase flocks, as Homer puts it in the Iliad:  “Son was he of Phorbas, the dearest of Trojans to Hermes, Rich in flocks, for the god vouchsafed him wealth in abundance.”  The story told at the mysteries of the Mother about Hermes and the ram I know but do not relate.  After the image of Hermes come Poseidon, Leucothea, and Palaemon on a dolphin. [2.3.5] The Corinthians have baths in many parts of the city, some put up at the public charge and one by the emperor Hadrian.  The most famous of them is near the Poseidon.  It was made by the Spartan Eurycles,1 who beautified it with various kinds of stone, especially the one quarried at Croceae in Laconia. On the left of the entrance stands a Poseidon, and after him Artemis hunting.  Throughout the city are many wells, for the Corinthians have a copious supply of flowing water, besides the water which the emperor Hadrian brought from Lake Stymphalus, but the most noteworthy is the one by the side of the image of Artemis.  Over it is a Bellerophontes, and the water flows through the hoof of the horse Pegasus.

**The Road to Sicyon**

[2.3.6] As you go along another road from the market-place, which leads to Sicyon, you can see on the right of the road a temple and bronze image of Apollo, and a little farther on a well called the Well of Glauce.  Into this they say she threw herself in the belief that the water would be a cure for the drugs of Medea. Above this well has been built what is called the Odeum (Music Hall), beside which is the tomb of Medea's children. Their names were Mermerus and Pheres, and they are said to have been stoned to death by the

Corinthians owing to the gifts which legend says they brought to Glauce. [2.3.7] But as their death was violent and illegal, the young babies of the Corinthians were destroyed by them until, at the command of the oracle, yearly sacrifices were established in their honor and a figure of Terror was set up. This figure still exists, being the likeness of a woman frightful to look upon but after Corinth was laid waste by the Romans and the old Corinthians were wiped out, the new settlers broke the custom of offering those sacrifices to the sons of Medea, nor do their children cut their hair for them or wear black clothes. [2.3.8] On the occasion referred to Medea went to Athens and married Aegeus, but subsequently she was detected plotting against Theseus and fled from Athens also; coming to the land then called Aria she caused its inhabitants to be named after her Medes. The son, whom she brought with her in her flight to the Arii, they say she had by Aegeus, and that his name was Medus. Hellanicus, however, calls him Polyxenus and says that his father was Jason. [2.3.9] The Greeks have an epic poem called Naupactia.  In this Jason is represented as having removed his home after the death of Pelias from Iolcus to Corcyra, and Mermerus, the elder of his children, to have been killed by a lioness while hunting on the mainland opposite.  Of Pheres is recorded nothing. But Cinaethon1 of Lacedaemon, another writer of pedigrees in verse, said that Jason's children by Medea were a son Medeus and a daughter Eriopis; he too, however, gives no further information about these children. [2.3.10] Eumelus said that Helius (Sun) gave the Asopian land to Aloeus and Epliyraea to Aeetes. When Aeetes was departing for Colchis he entrusted his land to Bunus, the son of Hermes and Alcidamea, and when Bunus died Epopeus the son of Aloeus extended his kingdom to include the Ephyraeans.  Afterwards, when Corinthus, the son of Marathon, died childless, the Corinthians sent for Medea from Iolcus and bestowed upon her the kingdom. [2.3.11] Through her Jason was king in Corinth, and Medea, as her children were born, carried each to the sanctuary of Hera and concealed them, doing so in the belief that so they would be immortal. At last she learned that her hopes were vain, and at the same time she was detected by Jason. When she begged for pardon he refused it, and sailed away to Iolcus.  For these reasons Medea too departed, and handed over the kingdom to Sisyphus. [2.4.1] This is the account that I read, and not far from the tomb is the temple of Athena Chalinitis (Bridler).  For Athena, they say, was the divinity who gave most help to Bellerophontes, and she delivered to him Pegasus, having herself broken in and bridled him.  The image of her is of wood, but face, hands and feet are of white marble.

**The Early History of Corinth**

[2.4.2] That Bellerophontes was not an absolute king, but was subject to Proetus and the Argives is the belief of myself and of all who have read carefully the Homeric poems.  When Bellerophontes migrated to Lycia it is clear that the Corinthians none the less were subject to the despots at Argos or Mycenae.  By themselves they provided no leader for the campaign against Troy, but shared in the expedition as part of the forces, Mycenaean and other, led by Agamemnon. [2.4.3] Sisyphus had other sons besides Glaucus, the father of Bellerophontes a second was Ornytion, and besides him there were Thersander and Almus.  Ornytion had a son Phocus, reputed to have been begotten by Poseidon.  He migrated to Tithorea in what is now called Phocis, but Thoas, the younger son of Ornytion, remained behind at Corinth.  Thoas begat Damophon, Damophon begat Propodas, and Propodas begat Doridas and Hyanthidas.  While these were kings the

Dorians took the field against Corinth, their leader being Aletes, the son of Hippotas, the son of Phylas, the son of Antiochus, the son of Heracles. So Doridas and Hyanthidas gave up the kingship to Aletes and remained at Corinth, but the Corinthian people were conquered in battle and expelled by the Dorians. [2.4.4] Aletes himself and his descendants reigned for five generations to Bacchis, the son of Prumnis, and, named after him, the Bacchidae reigned for five more generations to Telestes, the son of Aristodemus. Telestes was killed in hate by Arieus and Perantas, and there were no more kings, but Prytanes (Presidents) taken from the Bacchidae and ruling for one year, until Cypselus, the son of Eetion, became tyrant and expelled the Bacchidae.  Cypselus was a descendant of Melas, the son of Antasus. Melas from Gonussa above Sicyon joined the Dorians in the expedition against Corinth. When the god expressed disapproval Aletes at first ordered Melas to withdraw to other Greeks, but afterwards, mistaking the oracle, he received him as a settler.  Such I found to be the history of the Corinthian kings.

**The Road to Sicyon (cont.)**

[2.4.5] Now the sanctuary of Athena Chalinitis is by their theater, and near is a naked wooden image of Heracles, said to be a work of Daedalus.  All the works of this artist, although rather uncouth to look at, are nevertheless distinguished by a kind of inspiration.  Above the theater is a sanctuary of Zeus surnamed in the Latin tongue Capitolinus, which might be rendered into Greek "Coryphaeos".  Not far from this theater is the ancient gymnasium, and a spring called Lerna. Pillars stand around it, and seats have been made to refresh in summer time those who have entered it.  By this gymnasium are temples of Zeus and Asclepius.  The images of Asclepius and of Health are of white marble, that of Zeus is of bronze.

**The Road to the Acrocorinth**

[2.4.6]  The Acrocorinthus is a mountain peak above the city, assigned to Helius by Briareos when he acted as adjudicator, and handed over, the Corinthians say, by Helius to Aphrodite.  As you go up this Acrocorinthus you see two precincts of Isis, one if Isis surnamed Pelagian (Marine) and the other of Egyptian Isis, and two of Serapis, one of them being of Serapis called "in Canopus."  After these are altars to Helius, and a sanctuary of Necessity and Force, into which it is not customary to enter. [2.4.7] Above it are a temple of the Mother of the gods and a throne; the image and the throne are made of stone.  The temple of the Fates and that of Demeter and the Maid have images that are not exposed to view.  Here, too, is the temple of Hera Bunaea set up by Bunus the son of Hermes.  It is for this reason that the goddess is called Bunaea.

**The Summit of the Acrocorinth**

2.5.1] On the summit of the Acrocorinthus is a temple of Aphrodite.  The images are Aphrodite armed, Helius, and Eros with a bow.  The spring, which is behind the temple, they say was the gift of Asopus to Sisyphus.  The latter knew, so runs the legend, that Zeus had ravished Aegina, the daughter of Asopus, but refused to give information to the seeker before he had a spring given him on the Acrocorinthus. When Asopus granted this request Sisyphus turned informer, and on this account he receives--if anyone believes the story--punishment in Hades.  I have heard people say that this spring and Peirene are the same, the water in the city flowing hence under-ground. [2.5.2] This Asopus rises in the

Phliasian territory, flows through the Sicyonian, and empties itself into the sea here. His daughters, say the Phliasians, were Corcyra, Aegina, and Thebe. Corcyra and Aegina gave new names to the islands called Scheria and Oenone, while from Thebe is named the city below the Cadmea.  The Thebans do not agree, but say that Thebe was the daughter of the Boeotian, and not of the Phliasian, Asopus. [2.5.3] The other stories about the river are current among both the Phliasians and the Sicyonians, for instance that its water is foreign and not native, in that the Maeander, descending from Celaenae through Phrygia and Caria, and emptying itself into the sea at Miletus, goes to the Peloponnesus and forms the Asopus. I remember hearing a similar story from the Delians, that the stream which they call Inopus comes to them from the Nile. Further, there is a story that the Nile itself is the Euphrates, which disappears into a marsh, rises again beyond Aethiopia and becomes the Nile.

**Outside of Corinth**

[2.5.4] Such is the account I heard of the Asopus.  When you have turned from the Acrocorinthus into the mountain road you see the Teneatic gate and a sanctuary of Eilethyia.  The town called Tenea is just about sixty stades distant.  The inhabitants say that they are Trojans who were taken prisoners in Tenedos by the Greeks, and were permitted by Agamemnon to dwell in their present home.  For this reason they honor Apollo more than any other god. [2.5.5] As you go from Corinth, not into the interior but along the road to Sicyon, there is on the left not far from the city a burnt temple. There have, of course, been many wars carried on in Corinthian territory, and naturally houses and sanctuaries outside the wall have been fired.  But this temple, they say, was Apollo's, and Pyrrhus the son of Achilles burned it down.  Subsequently I heard another account, that the Corinthians built the temple for Olympian Zeus, and that suddenly fire from some quarter fell on it and destroyed it.

**\* \* \* \* \* \* END OF IMAGES SECTION \* \* \* \* \* \* \***

**C. Corinth in Relation to Pauline History**

 1. The **founding** of the Corinthian church.

**Read** Acts 18:1-22 (takes place about AD/CE 49-51)

Paul founded the Corinthian Church during his second missionary journey (cf. Acts 15:39-18:22). Check google for Paul’s journeys.

 2. The **chronological flow** of Paul's visits and correspondence with the

 Corinthian church.

The following reconstruction of Paul's relationship to Corinth represents the consensus of current scholarship. The following summary is taken from Ralph Martin, *New Testament Foundations*, 2:173-74 (cf. 34; cf. also *JSNT* 34 [1988]:47-69).

\* \* \* \* \*

**THE POSSIBLE SEQUENCE OF PAUL'S VISITS TO CORINTH**

Paul's motives and movements in connection with his visits to this city form a difficult complex, but the following outline of events is likely, and we shall base our discussion of his Corinthian correspondence on this reconstruction.

1. The founding of the church (Acts 18:1ff.).
2. Paul leaves Corinth and goes to Ephesus (Acts 18:18f.).
3. He sends the Corinthians a letter **[= actual 1 Cor**.], to which he refers in 1
 Corinthians 5:9, now lost (the “lost letter”), though some scholars believe
 that 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 may be a fragment of it.
4. He learns from "members of Chloe's household" (1 Cor. 1:11) that the church in Corinth is split into factions.
5. About the same time, Paul receives a letter from the Corinthians asking for his
 advice and guidance on certain issues affecting the ordering of worship and
 Christians' relations with the outside world (1 Cor. 7:1).
6. He responds to the factiousness and answers their request for advice by writing
 the letter we know as 1 Corinthians [= **actual 2 Cor., but our canonical 1
 Cor**.]. This letter is taken by Titus (cf. 2 Cor. 12:18, though this verse more
 probably refers to the "severe letter" visit of para. 10 below), who
 subsequently returns to Ephesus where Paul is.
7. Timothy is sent to Corinth on a special mission (1 Cor. 4:17; 16:10).
8. In the meantime a serious crisis breaks out in Corinth, fomented by the arrival of Jewish emissaries. Paul's authority is challenged (2 Cor. 10:10; 11:23;
 12:6f.). Timothy is evidently at a loss to deal with it and returns with the
 news to Ephesus.
9. On receiving Timothy's report, Paul pays a brief visit to Corinth, to deal with the
 issue in person. This he later refers to as the "painful visit" (2 Cor. 2:1). He is
 humiliated before the church, and has to return to Ephesus in great distress.
10. He now writes a powerful letter of remonstrance, at great cost to himself, in
 order to deal with the crisis (2 Cor. 2:4; 7:8). This is known as the "tearful"
 or the "severe letter," [**= actual 3 Cor**.] which is either lost or only partially
 preserved in 2 Corinthians 10-13. Titus is instructed to meet Paul at Troas.
11. According to the plan outlined in 1 Corinthians 16:5ff., but after some delay
 caused by the "intermediate visit" to Corinth (mentioned as para. 9 above),
 Paul leaves Ephesus for Macedonia. He comes to Troas, and cannot find
 Titus; so he goes on to Macedonia to intercept him (2 Cor. 2:12f.).
12. Paul meets Titus, who relates that the worst is over, and the rebellion is quelled
 (2 Cor. 7:6-16).
 13. He writes the letter we have as 2 Corinthians [= actual 4 Cor., but out canonical
 2 Cor.], either in its entirety (in which case the last four chapters are aimed at
 clearing up the remaining pockets of resistance and opposition in the church)
 or in part (that is, what we know as chapters 1-9). This letter he sends from
 Macedonia through Titus, accompanied by two other brethren.

14. Paul himself reaches Corinth (Acts 20:2).

\* \* \* \* End of Martin Insert \* \* \* \*

**PAUL’S MISSONARY JOURNEYS … Another overview of Paul’s sequence of ministry.**

For convenience, the following is mostly from: <http://www.simplybible.com/f757.htm>

Traditionally, Paul is said to have made three missionary journeys, plus a fourth journey to Rome. In the Acts Facts series, I have retained this traditional manner of dividing up Paul’s several journeys recorded in the book of Acts. This enables you to more easily relate our studies with other studies, references, and maps, which most likely adhere to the same scheme.

The four journeys of Paul are...

* 1st missionary journey (Acts 13:4 to 15:35).
* 2nd missionary journey (Acts 15:36 to 18:22).
* 3rd missionary journey (Acts 18:23 to 21:17).
* Journey to Rome (Acts 27:1 to 28:16).

The first two journeys start and end in Syrian Antioch. The third journey starts in Antioch and ends in Jerusalem. Starting from Jerusalem, the fourth journey ends in Rome. See also [Paul's trips to Jerusalem](http://www.simplybible.com/f206.htm#Trips).

**A. After Paul’s Conversion**

In Acts 9, Luke records the period between Paul’s conversion and his first missionary journey. In this period Paul was known as Saul. Paul himself speaks of this period in Acts 22 and 26, as well as Galatians 1:13-17. Putting information from all these sources together, we find the following activities between Paul’s conversion and first missionary journey.

* After his conversion in Damascus, Paul very nearly lost his life (Acts 9:19-25).
* Paul went away into Arabia for three years, being taught by Jesus Christ (Galatians 1:17-18).
* Paul then came to Jerusalem where he was assisted by Barnabas. Again his life was threatened, so he went home to Tarsus (Galatians 1:18-24, Acts 9:26-30).
* Paul next went to Antoch in Syria. From there, he was sent down to Judea with aid for the brethren in need because of famine (Acts 11:19-30).
* Paul and Barnabas then returned to Syrian Antioch (Acts 12:25).
* At Antioch, Paul and Barnabas are called to embark on what is known as the 1st missionary journey (Acts 13:1-3).

**B. The 1st Missionary Journey**

* From Antioch’s seaport Selucia, they sail to Cyprus, and work throughout the island (Acts 13:4-12).
* Next they go to Pamphylia and the other Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13:13-52)..
* They went down to Lycaonia, working in Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe (Acts 14:1-23).
* Passing through Pisidia and Pamphylia again, they then worked in Perga (Acts 14:24).
* They went down to Attalia and caught a ship back to Syrian Antioch (Acts 14:25-27).

 **C. Period in Syrian Antioch**

* Between the 1st and 2nd missionary journeys there was "a long time" in Antioch in Syria (Acts 14:28).
* During this period, Paul, Barnabas, and other companions had to go up to Jerusalem to attend a council of the apostles regarding the issue of Christians keeping the law of Moses (Acts 15:1-29).
* Paul returned to Antioch and worked there a while (Acts 15:30-35).

**D. The 2nd Missionary Journey**

* Paul chose Silas and embarked on a journey that began by revisiting the places tPaul had worked on his 1st journey (Acts 15:36-41).
* They worked in Derbe, Lystra, Iconium. Timothy joined Paul and Silas.
* Paul, with Silas and Timothy, went through the regions of Phrygia and Galatia, then on to Troas (Acts 16:1-8)
* Paul received a vision calling him to Macedonia (Acts 16:9-40, 17:1-14).
* Paul went down to Achaia and worked in Athens (Acts 17:15-34).
* After Athens he went to work in Corinth where he met Aquila and Priscilla (Acts 18:1-17).
* From Corinth Paul went to Ephesus (Acts 18:18-21).
* He took a ship to Caesarea, visiting the church there, then went back to Syrian Antioch (Acts 18:21-22).

**E. The 3rd Missionary Journey**

* After a time in Antioch, Paul set off again and visited with the churches again in Galatia and Phrygia (Acts 18:23)
* Paul next returned to Ephesus where his work caused an uproar (Acts 19:1-41).
* Paul then revisited Macedonia and Greece, and came to Troas and after that to Miletus (Acts 20:1-38).
* From Miletus Paul sailed to Caesarea and then went to Jerusalem (Acts 21:1-17).

**F. Period in Jerusalem and Caesarea**

* In Jerusalem Paul had a meeting with James and the elders (Acts 21:18-26).
* Paul was caused trouble by the Jews (Acts 21:27-40).
* Paul told his story publicly and nearly got flogged (Acts 28).
* Paul went on trial and is escorted to Caesarea (Acts 23:1-35).
* He was imprisoned in Caesarea and goes before Felix (Acts 24)
* When he appeared before Festus he appealed to Caesar (Acts 25).
* Paul next appeared before Agrippa (Acts 26).

**G. Journey to Rome**

* Paul sails for Rome under escort. On the way, he is shipwrecked (Acts 27)
* His journey from Malta to Rome (Acts 28:1-15).
* His house arrest in Rome (Acts 28:16-31).

**\* \* \* \* \* END OF PAUL’S JOURNEY’S INSERT \* \* \* \* \* \* \***

3. The complexion of the Corinthian church.

1:26 (cf. 11:17-34) Class struggle

2:1-5 Intellectural pride

Acts 18:8; Rom 16:23 Influencial converts

1 Cor 3, 5, 6 Problems: party spirit, moral laxity

6:9-11a Formal immorality

1 Cor 7 (cf. ch. 15) Sexual issues

1 Cor 12-14 Lack of unity & love

12:2 Jewish presence

1 Cor 8:9; 10:23 Misunderstanding of “freedom;” an over-realized eschatology

**D. The Dates and Places of Composition of the Canonical Corinthian Epistles**

 1. First Corinthians was written by Paul at Ephesus (1 Cor 16:8) during his third missionary journey (A.D. 54-55).

 Cf. the implications of 1 Cor 16:8, 19; cf. Acts 19:1-41

* attestation of Clement of Rome (1 Clement 37:5; 47:1-3; 49:5) about A.D. 95.
* the genuineness of 1 Corinthians is not disputed

 2. Second Corinthians was written a few months after first Corinthians somewhere (Philippi?) in Macedonia (A.D. 55 or 56).

* cf. Acts 20:1-6
* The authenticity of 2 Corinthians is basically uncontested. The Pauline origin of 2 Cor 6:17-7:1 is debated by some (see Kummel, *Intro to the NT*, pp. 287ff).
* The unity of 2 Corinthians has been greatly debated with regard to the relationship of 2 Cor 10-13 and 1-9 (cf. Kummel, pp. 288-93).

**E. The Essential Characteristics of the Corinthian Epistles**

 1. First Corinthians: Unity in the local church.

 1a. The need for unity is the permeating theme of 1 Corinthians.

 Party spirit
 Lord's Supper
 Spiritual gifts
 Individual freedom
 Unity is not uniformity but the appreciation of diversity.

 2a. Key terms

 know, judge, discern
 spirit, spiritual
 knowledge, wisdom
 church, world
 power (= authority, ἐξουσία)
 holy, sanctify

 3a. A personal emphasis is noted by 146 occurrences of the personal pronoun "you."

 2. Second Corinthians: Pauline autobiography.

 1a. The most revealing book in the NT of Paul's personal life and feelings.

 2 Corinthians reveals Paul's pastoral heart.

 2a. Key terms

 weakness
 tribulation
 comfort
 boasting
 ministry
 glory

**F. Structural Issues in the Corinthian Epistles**

1 Corinthians uses **two literary patterns** to indicate its structure.

* First, statements in **1:11; 5:1 and 7:1** indicate communication patterns between Paul and the Corinthians.
* Second, the use of the Greek idiom *peri de* (περὶ δὲ ), “now concerning” (ASV), introduces most of the major subjects Paul treats.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [This col. has Greek and will not show without the Accordance font Helena. Just view the English as this is discussed.]1Cor. 7:1 Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε, καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἅπτεσθαι·1Cor. 7:25 Περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων ἐπιταγὴν κυρίου οὐκ ἔχω, γνώμην δὲ δίδωμι ὡς ἠλεημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι. 1Cor. 8:1 Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, οἴδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γνῶσιν ἔχομεν. ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ· 1Cor. 12:1 Περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν, ἀδελφοί, οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν. 1Cor. 16:1 Περὶ δὲ τῆς λογείας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους ὥσπερ διέταξα ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιήσατε. 1Cor. 16:12 Περὶ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, πολλὰ παρεκάλεσα αὐτόν, ἵνα ἔλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν· καὶ πάντως οὐκ ἦν θέλημα ἵνα νῦν ἔλθῃ· ἐλεύσεται δὲ ὅταν εὐκαιρήσῃ. 1Th. 4:9 Περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε γράφειν ὑμῖν, αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὑμεῖς θεοδίδακτοί ἐστε εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους, 1Th. 5:1 Περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν, ἀδελφοί, οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε ὑμῖν γράφεσθαι,  | “Now concerning” in the ASV consistently translates the Greek… *peri de*1Cor. 7:1 **Now concerning** the things whereof ye wrote: It is good for a man not to touch a woman. 1Cor. 7:25 **Now concerning** virgins I have no commandment of the Lord: but I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be trustworthy. 1Cor. 8:1 **Now concerning** things sacrificed to idols: We know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth. 1Cor. 12:1 **Now concerning** spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant. 1Cor. 16:1 **Now concerning** the collection for the saints, as I gave order to the churches of Galatia, so also do ye. 1Cor. 16:12 **But as touching** Apollos the brother, I besought him much to come unto you with the brethren: and it was not all his will to come now; but he will come when he shall have opportunity. 1Th. 4:9 **But concerning** love of the brethren ye have no need that one write unto you: for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another; 1Th. 5:1 **But concerning** the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that aught be written unto you. |

The following outlines give only the broad divisions so not to influence each student's outlining work on the basis of paragraph analysis.

 1. A structural outline of **1 Corinthians** based on internal indicators.

 I. Introductory Remarks (1:1-9).
 II. Paul's Response to the Oral Communique from Chloe's Household (1:10-
 4:21 [1:11])
 III. Paul's Response to Certain Oral Reports/Rumors (chs. 5, 6 [5:1 "actually
 reported"]
 Fornication (5)
 Litigation (6)
 IV. Paul's Response to a Written Communique from Corinth (7:1-16:4)
 Problems/questions regarding:
 marriage (7)
 meat offered to idols (8-10)
 church order (11)
 spiritual gifts (12-14)
 resurrection (15)
 collections (16)
 V. Concluding Remarks (16:5-24).

 2. **2 Corinthians** (outline adapted from Kent, pp. 21-22)

 I. Greeting and Thanksgiving (1:1-11)
 II. Paul's Relations with the Corinthians (1:12-7:16)
 A. The change of itinerary (1:12-2:13)
 B. The character of Paul's ministry (2:14-6:10)
 C. An appeal for separation from sin and full reconciliation to Paul (6:11-
 7:16).
III. Paul's Observations Concerning the Collection for the Poor Christians in Jerusalem (8:1-9:15).
 IV. Paul's Apostolic Authority (10:1-13:10)
 A. Paul's defense of his authority (10:1-11:15)
 B. Paul's personal history as an apostle (11:16-12:13)
 C. Paul's proposed third visit to Corinth (12:14-13:10)
V. Final Greeting (13:11-14)
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**1 CORINTHIANS OUTLINED NOTES**

**Gary T. Meadors, Th.D.**

 **Paul's Epistolary Introduction to First Corinthians (1:1-9)**

**NT Letters/Epistles**

In modern analysis the term "letter" is often preferred over "epistle." The reason is that an analysis of ancient documents, especially papyri, reveal that letters were forms of personal correspondence and epistles were formal and for the general public.

The above distinction is made on the basis of comparing ancient documents and applying modern terminology. The NT consistently uses the term *epistole* (ἐπιστολή) to refer to written correspondence (Acts 9:2; 15:30; 22:5; 23:25; 23:33; Rom. 16:22; 1 Cor. 5:9; 16:3; 2 Cor. 3:1, 2, 3; 7:8 [2]; 10:9, 10, 11; Col. 4:16; 1 Thes. 5:27; 2 Thes. 2:2, 15; 3:14, 17; 2 Pet. 3:1, 16). *epistole* is translated by English versions as "epistle" and/or "letter."

By ancient standards, most NT epistles are actually letter genre. Some view Romans with its more formal style as approaching an epistle in the ancient sense (cf. the article on "Letter" in *Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible,* 3:113-15). Letter form contains the following elements (from Doty, p. 14).

 Introduction (prescript or salutation)

 including: sender, addressee, greetings, and often additional greetings or wish for good health [or a statement of thanksgiving]

 Text or Body preceded by characteristic introductory formulae.

 Conclusion including: greetings, wishes, especially for persons other than the addressee; final greeting or prayer sentence, and sometimes dating.

Here is an example of a common Greek letter (Doty, 13, from P. Par. 43. 154 B.C.E.):

Serapion to his brothers Ptolemaeus and Apollonius greeting. If you are well, it would be excellent. I myself am well. I have made a contract with the daughter of Heperus and intend to marry her in the month of Mesore. Please send me half a chous of oil. I have written to you to let you know. Goodbye. Year 28, Epeiph 21. Come for the wedding day. Apollonius.

The term "greeting" (χαίρειv) is the standard Greek salutation. In the NT it occurs three times (Acts 15:23; 23:26; Js. 1:1) and is only used by James in a NT letter. Paul does not use χαίρειv, but rather a simple or combined use of the terms χάρις and εiρήvη (grace and peace). The OT and Jewish letters often used "peace" (cf. Ezra 4:17; 5:7 and IDB, 3:114b, c).

It is also interesting that 2 Mac. 1:1 combines χαίρειv and εἰρήνην.

 2Mac. 1:1   The Jews in Jerusalem and those in the land of Judea,
 To their Jewish kindred in Egypt,
 Greetings and true peace.

1 Corinthians also follows the First Century letter pattern:

 Introduction 1:1-9
 Main Body 1:10-16:18
 Closing 16:19-24

We may therefore observe that 1 Cor. 1:1-9 follows the Greek letter pattern for an introduction.

 A. The identity of the senders (1:1)
 1. Paul - the author
 2. Sosthenes – the associate
 B. The identity of the addressees (1:2)
 1. Their corporate identity (v. 2a)
 2. Their spiritual identity (v. 2b)
 C. The salutation (1:3)
 1. The salutatory duo - grace and peace
 2. The divine duo - Father and Son
 D. The thanksgiving (1:4-9)
 1. The statement of thanksgiving (1:4)
 2. The reason for thanksgiving
 1a. Enriched by God (1:5, 6)
 2a. Endowed by God (1:7)
 3. The confidence of thanksgiving (1:8-9)

**Paul’s Introduction to His “First” Letter to the Corinthians (1:1-9)**

**Selective observations** from the “Introduction”:

* Consider that a writer’s introduction sets up the “body” of the letter to follow. In light of this…
* 1:4 is sort of a “*captatio benevolentiae*” (‘striving for good attention’, Fitzmyer, 130…say something they want to hear to get their attention!). Note the absence of a prayer which is common in Paul’s salutations.
* Five times in 1:1-9 Jesus is “Lord” (1:2, 3, 7, 8, 9), and in 1:2 it is understood as supplied with “their,” “their Lord…”
* In 1:5-7, Paul’s reason for being thankful for the Corinthians is exactly in the categories he will later criticize:
	+ In 1:5, they are “enriched” in “speech” and “knowledge”
	+ In 1:7, the result is that they are “endowed” with ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι ἀπεκδεχομένους / “in not one ‘charisma’ lacking.”
* 1:9 helps us with the term *koinonia*/κοινωνία. This term is usually translated “fellowship,” which is often thought of in modern terms as having a good time with each other. In the NT, however, *koinonia* is more about “what is shared in common.” To be called into the fellowship of his Son means to have in common eternal life, to be “saved” or however you describe the salvation product.

Remember, Epistles were letters to a gathering of Christ believers. A copy arrived and was then read to that gathering.

* The content of an Epistle was based on the “occasion” for which the writer wrote. The letter is a “one-way” communication. That is, we are only hearing the writer’s side of the occasion and we have to reconstruct the other side.
* This letter is addressed to “the church of God in Corinth.” Since Corinth was a sizable city in its time, it is unlikely that the whole group always met at one place and one time.
* Imagine yourself as a first century Christian in Corinth. When you HEAR this introduction, what would you hear?

1:1 On the subject of “will of God,” see

 Gary T. Meadors, *Decision Making God’s Way: A New Model for Knowing God’s Will.* Baker, 2003. Now available in LOGOS (you do not need the whole program to procure an electronic copy).

 **1 CORINTHIANS OUTLINED NOTES**

**Gary T. Meadors, Th.D.**

 I. Paul's Epistolary Introduction to First Corinthians (1:1-9)

II. Paul's Response to the Oral Communique from Chloe's Household (1:10-4:21 [cf. 1:11])

**Now that we have entered the “text” of 1 Corinthians, we need to reflect on what is the best way for me, your teacher, to convey to you information about the text. There are two major options:**

* **To walk through the paragraphs and verses of each section and comment on key phrases. This would be a “commentary” method.**
* **To highlight “how” the text is organized (See especially Talbert’s *Reading Corinthians*) so you get the large thought picture of what Paul is saying.**
* **Some combination of these two methods.**

 **To merely do a “commentary” approach in an online audio/video would be excruciatingly boring! You are better off reading/researching the commentary on your own.**

**Our time together is for you an opportunity to study 1 Corinthians. No teacher can tell you everything you need to know about any book of the Bible! Just look at the massive commentary literature and special studies on a book like 1 Corinthians.**

**My intention is to give you “the big picture,” fill in some key details that help to understand that picture, and do excurses (special studies) on subjects of perennial interest that arise because of the text. In other words, we will endeavor to state the “direct” teaching along with the “implicational” and “creative constructs” that have been born from it.**

There are **two observations** that help me to think through the unit of 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21

**FIRST** is the structural analysis of THREE RHETORICAL QUESTIONS by Paul in 1:13 (See Charles Talbert in *Reading Corinthians*.):
 The Three Questions:
 1. Is Christ divided?
 2. Was Paul crucified for you?
 3. Were you baptized in the name of Paul?
 The Answers albeit in reverse order:
 3. Were you baptized in the name of Paul? (1:14-16)
 2. Was Paul crucified for you? (1:17-3:4)
 Part I (1:18-31)
 Part II (2:1-5; 2:6-3:4)
 1. Is Christ divided? (3:5-4:7)
 3:5-23
 4:1-7
 Conclusion (4:8-21)

**SECOND** is by gaining insight into Roman Corinth

While it is easy to say, “They are just acting like sinful human beings *always* act,” you would miss a specific issue within that Roman culture. Winter’s treatment of public speaking/teaching in Roman Corinth informs our reading of 1 Cor 1-4 [Bruce Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Eerdmans, 2001. Chapter 3]. The characteristics of the Roman cultural context are reflected in what Paul is evaluating in regard to the problems in the Corinthian church.

The theme verse that is noted to govern this cultural context in chs 1-4 is 3:3. Here are some renditions of the final key phrase, “…

 …κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε;
 “…do you not walk after the manner of men?” (ASV)
 “…Are you not acting like mere humans?” (NIV2011)
 “…are you not … behaving in a secular human way?” (Fitzmyer, AB)
 “…are you not … operating in a secular fashion?” (Winter, Fee)

Winter’s analysis (Chapter 2) of this phrase exposes how Roman culture “secular discipleship” is reflected in the “Christian competitiveness” of 1 Cor. 1-4. These new Christians had adopted a “secular fashion” in their Christian behavior.

* The term “disciple” was quite common in the Greek/Roman world. It basically indicated someone who was an apprentice/student of another. There were disciples of the Pharisees, disciples of Jesus and disciples of the various philosophies and teachers of the day.
* The role of the disciple was to learn his mentors trade. That “trade” might be tent making or it might be civil service such as courts. In a trade like “oratory,” a disciple would learn to imitate (*imitatio*) his master in his *manner* of speech and even behavioral traits including one’s appearance.
* Winter points out that there was a “renaissance” of the “Sophists” (called Second Sophistic) in the First Century AD/CE. The term “disciple” is used in the literature of the Second Sophistic 181 times (Winter, 32).
* This paradigm was training the “orators” of the time. These orators argued a variety of “cases” in many different public venues. In the first century, the Orator was a major career path.
* In Roman Corinth, there are a number of traits of the Orator (Winter 36ff.):
	+ There was an intense professional competitiveness among teachers which was passed on to their students/disciples.
		- This competition was often to gain “honor” (*dignitas*) in the “City” system. At the same time, if you loose, you could suffer a “loss of *dignitas*” which could influence your privilege and standing in the City.
		- Corinth was a “notoriously litigious society” (Winter 38). The rivalry that was a part of this oratory culture was at time so bad

that Rome itself had to intervene.

* + Disciples were expected to have exclusive loyalty to their teacher. The term “zealot” was applied to them. here were fiercely loyal to their teacher and his views.

**So, when Paul accuses the Corinthians of “living in a secular fashion,” they were actually living in a way they had learned in their OWN culture**. Some of them were probably deeply engrained in the *dignitas* of the City and had much to loose if they chose another life-style. We could say that they were acting “naturally.” Paul reverses this in at least 5 ways (Winter, 42-43):

1. Contrary to pledging loyalty to A person (like Paul, Apolos or Peter), all believers are one in loyalty to Christ (3:21-23).
2. Believers’ roles are for “functions/tasks” not “status” (3:5-7).
3. Believers are to view their leaders as “servants,” stewards of God’s mysteries (4:1ff.).
4. Paul’s statement in 2:1-5 undermines the “power plays” of the teacher/disciple motif of Roman culture.
5. Paul shifts the image from disciple (which in Roman culture would be misunderstood) to a “filial”/family imagery. The noun “disciple” is NEVER used in Pauline literature… the terms of “brothers” [includes sisters], “beloved brothers” are used 29 times (Cf. “Father” in 4:15). In fact (for whatever reason), the noun disciple never occurs in the NT outside the Gospels and Acts.

**A Traditional Outline of 1:10-4:21**

 A. Paul states the problem of division which Chloe's household reported as existing in the Corinthian Church (1:10-17).

 1. An appeal for unity because of the problem of division (1:10-12).

 1a. The appeal (10).

It is noteworthy that Paul’s appeal calls the Corinthian believers “brothers and sisters” (NIV; Greek just has “brethren” but the feminine is rightly understood). He never addresses them as “disciples”! In fact, the noun disciple never occurs outside the Gospels and Acts (where it has Jewish overtones). The epistles shift to “filial”/family terminology, “brothers and sisters.”

Fitzmyer (AB) notes that this letter is an Hellenistic letter of “admonition,” as an ancient letter it is categorized as *typos nouthetikos* (56). E.g., “You are a Christian;” “Act like a Christian.” The indicative is followed by the imperative. See Fitzmyer’s list of rhetorical devices (66-67).

An interesting feature of 1 Corinthians is the presence of **“slogans.”** Paul takes the dictums of the Corinthians, quotes it, then responds to it with clarification and/or correction. That is, Paul says what they say then declares how it should be understood (an appeal). Fitzmyer (56) identifies the following slogans (Note: items like this should be in Greek, but this course does not assume auditors know Greek. Therefore, we will work from the ASV1901 and the NIV2011 for most of our renditions):

 ASV1901 NIV2011

 Most likely: 6:12a “all things are lawful for me” / “I have the right to do anything”

 6:13a “meats for the belly and the / “food for the stomach and the stomach
 belly for meats; but God for food, and God will destroy
 shall bring to nought both them both.”
 it and them.”

 8:1 “We know that we all “We all possess knowledge”
 have knowledge”

 8:4 (2) “no idol is anything in “An idol is nothing at all in the
 the world” world”
 “there is no God but one” “There is no God but one”

 8:5 “there are gods many “there are many gods
 and lords many” and many lords”

 10:23 “all things are lawful” (2x) “I have the right to do anything”

 15:12b “there is no resurrection “there is no resurrection
 of the dead” of the dead”

 Possibly: 1:12 “I am of…” “I follow…”

 7:1b “It is good for a man not “It is good for a man not to have
 to touch a woman” sexual relations with a woman”

 8:8 “But food will not commend “But food does not bring us near
 us to God; neither, if we eat to God; we are no worse if we
 not, are we the worse; nor, do not eat, and no better
 if we eat, are we the better.” if we do.”

 11:2 possible “indirect” quotation (see Fitzmyer, 408)

 Probably: 14:34-35 See introduction “validation” handout and text lecture.

These features support the genre of an “appeal” letter.

 2a. The report (11-12)

This report reflects how the new Corinthians believers were adopting a “loyalty” stance toward the teacher they chose…as if these Christian teachers were in competition with one another just like the Sophists in the First Century. “Jealousy” in 3:3 is the term “zealot.” Note how 3:4 repeats the idea of “secular fashion.”

Remember that it seems the Corinthians view Apollos as powerful (his oratory; Acts 18:24, 28) and Paul’s physical presence was lacking (cf. 2 Cor 10:10). These traits were cultural measurements of oratorical “correctness.”

When the details are probed in light of the oratory culture, the behavior of the Corinthians is then understood as “worldly.”

 2. A rhetorical evaluation of the problem of division (1:13-17).

 1a. The rhetorical questions (v. 13).
 2a. The response (vv. 14-17).

 1b. Paul's reflection on acts which some twist into hero worship (vv. 14-16).
2b. Paul's statement of his ministerial intention (v. 17).

"Some at least of the Corinthians were setting too high a value on human wisdom and human eloquence in line with the typical Greek admiration for rhetoric and philosophical studies. In the face of this Paul insists that preaching with wisdom of words was no part of his commission. That kind of preaching would draw men to the preacher. It would nullify the cross of Christ. The faithful preaching of the cross results in men ceasing to put their trust in any human device, and relying rather on God's work in Christ. A reliance on rhetoric would cause men to trust in men, the very antithesis of what the preaching of the cross is meant to effect" (Morris, p. 42).

 B. Paul evaluates the problem of division which Chloe's household reported as existing in the Corinthian Church (1:18-4:21).

 1. He evaluates the problem of division by an appeal to the nature of the gospel (1:18-2:16).

 1a. Pseudo human wisdom fails to understand the message of the cross (1:18-25).

The preaching of a crucified savior does not measure up to worldly wisdom propositions. Rather, such a message is viewed as foolish. Human wisdom views the content of the gospel as foolish.

 1b. Intro. theme statement (18).
 2b. God's opinion of pseudo human wisdom (19-21).
 3b. God's wisdom was demonstrated in the cross (22-25).

 2a. Human pride—part of a divisive spirit—fails to appreciate one's standing before God (1:26-31).

If some of the Corinthians are tempted to become "top heavy," they should remember whence they came and give God the glory. Such a self evaluation will produce humility rather than intellectual pride. Human wisdom often views the recipients of the gospel as foolish.

 1b. Paul rehearses the Corinthians' past (vv. 26-30).

 1c. The call to remember (v. 26a).
 2c. The description of the past (v. 26b).
 3c. The description of God's grace (vv. 27-30).

 2b. Paul's conclusion (v. 31).

 3a. Divided attitudes failed to evaluate accurately Paul's original ministry with the Corinthians (2:1-5).

Paul's personal example demonstrated the wisdom and power of God. How was Paul’s example in contrast to Winter’s description of public speakers of the era?

Historical ques. - How does this relate to Paul's travels on his second missionary journey - especially arriving in Corinth after his Athenian confrontation? Is 1 Cor 2:1-5 a confession that Paul used a philosophical apologetic at Athens, but discovered it did not work and is now changing his strategy?

 4a. Division resulted from a failure to appreciate the source and authority of Paul's message (2:6-16).

Paul gives the Corinthians an insight into the nature and process of God's revelatory work. This process results in a wisdom that transcends human, inductive analysis and lays the philosophical foundations for the accurate explication of all created reality.

2:6-16 is sort of a watershed for Paul’s apologetics for his apostolic authority and mission. His authority does not rest in himself but in that his words are God’s word.

Walter Kaiser provides an analysis of this section. The student is encouraged to locate and read the following article at this time.

READ:

**Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. "A Neglected Text in Bibliology Discussions: 1 Corinthians 2:6-16." *Westminster Theological Journal* 43 (Spring 1981):301-19.**

 1b. Paul reveals the nature of gospel wisdom (2:6-9)

Intro. The key to understand 2:6-16 resides in the identification of pronoun antecedents.

* The first person is used throughout the passage 2:6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 16.
* 3:1 and 2:6 appear to relate to one another and imply that the pronouns of 2:6-16 either refer to Paul and his kind -- writers of Scripture and thus God's vehicles for revealing divine wisdom -- or they primarily refer to Paul himself with the humble courtesy of a plural for Paul's associates.

 1c. The nature of gospel wisdom is such that it is only received by spiritual (= mature) believers (2:6).

 cf."full-grown" with spiritual in 2:15 (also
14:37-38) and the contrast of 3:1.

 2c. The nature of gospel wisdom is delineated (vv. 7-9).

 Paul's development of the wisdom which he speaks is developed by five modifying units attached to "wisdom" (v. 7) and then his clinching conclusion in verse 9.

 A simplified diagram reveals this flow.

 we speak wisdom
 God's
 in a mystery
 that hath been
 hidden which God
 foreordained
 which rulers
 didn't know

 **But, v. 9 conclusion = an epistemological dilemma**

 Then v. 10 solves the dilemma

 Paul is making the point that divine wisdom in terms of the gospel is unique. It
 comes by direct revelation (2:10) and is therefore epistemologically unique.

 2b. Paul states that his wisdom was received by direct revelation (2:10-13)

1c. The means of revelation is from the Spirit of God (vv. 10-12). Cf. John 14:26; 16:13-15.

 1d. The affirmation of revelation event (v. 10a).

 2d. The explanation of revelation event (vv. 10b-12).

 1e. The Spirit penetrates the unfathomable (v. 10b).

 2e. The Spirit, as a member of the Trinity, knows the Divine Mind (v. 11) like a man knows himself.

 3e. The Spirit was/is the apostle's source (v. 12).

2c. The manner of revelation is an operation of the Spirit (v. 13).

 1d. Paul affirms that his speech/testing is not really his but that which he received by revelation (v. 13a).

 2d. Paul affirms that his speech/teaching is actually and specifically (words) provided by the Spirit (v. 13b).

 3d. Paul affirms the method by which this process took place (v. 13c).

 3b.Paul delineates the application of spiritual truth (2:14-16)

1c. The “unregenerate person” (Ciampa) or the “resistant-to-apostles Christian” (Fitzmyer) does not have the independent capacity to correctly signify spiritual truth (v. 14). [SEE the sources noted here for unpacking this text]

 πνευματικόν - used 6 times in NT

 1 Cor. 15:44 (x2), 46;

 James 3:15; Jude 19

 “Signifying” means engaging, not simply understanding the plain statements.

2c. The regenerate person has the capacity to signify spiritual truth (v. 15).

 cf. the "he that is spiritual" of 2:15 with the "full-grown" of 2:6.

3c. Paul's concluding affirmation (v. 16).

 1d. He affirms the nature of divine wisdom by quoting Isaiah 40:13 (cf. Rom. 11:34) (v. 16a).

 The term "mind" may correlate with "spirit" but be present because the LXX of Isaiah uses "mind" (contrast Heb. - "spirit").

 2d. He affirms the possession of divine wisdom (v. 16b).

 "mind of Christ" = biblical revelation, not a ‘Vulcan mind transfer!’ (Star Wars metaphor!)

 **\* \* SPECIAL ISSUES INSET: EPISTEMOLOGY \* \***

The spirit and guidance during the church age is a key epistemological question. 1 Cor 2 is often used as a proof text for this theological construct.

I. EPISTEMOLOGY AND THE CONCEPT OF "ILLUMINATION": 1 COR 2:6-16 IN THE CONTEXT OF CHS. 1-4

 A. The concept of illumination--"the inner witness of the Spirit"

 Consider some of the passages which refer to the witness:

 Rom 8:16: "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God."

 1 Jn 5:10: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in him."

 Rom 5:5 "The love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit."

 1. A historical overview of this subject

 1a. Conflict between the Roman Catholic Church and the Reformers concerning the issue of authority.

For Romanism, the Church exercised ultimate authority, including the sole authority to state what Scripture means.

For the Reformers, authority resides in Scripture alone and the believer has the right and responsibility to study the Scriptures and come to conclusions concerning its meaning.

 2a. John Calvin (Institutes, 1.vii-ix)

Calvin changed the equation from the Word/Church to the Word/Spirit. He called it the doctrine of the "testimonium". **Calvin viewed the role of the Spirit to be that of convicting the believers heart concerning the truthfulness and authority of Scripture: "...the efficacious confirmation of the Word"** (ix, 2). For Calvin, the role of the Spirit was one of persuasion, not content. The content was the Word to which the Spirit bore witness.

As Ramm (*Witness of the Spirit* [Eerdmans, 1959]) summarized Calvin, "Because the *testimonium* is a persuasion, it is a persuasion about something. It is not its own content. The *testimonium* is a revealing action, not a revealed content. It is an illumination, not a communication. For this reason Calvin opposed the enthusiasts who claimed a revelation with a content" (p. 18).

 2. A theological overview of this subject

 1a. The witness of the Spirit in relation to the Trinity

The role of the Spirit is to exalt Christ. The Spirit is never imaged as an end in himself but as a means to an end--Christ. He leads us to Christ; glorifies Christ; and teaches us Christ through the Word.

"Reflection upon the person and work of the Holy Spirit reveals that he is the executive of the Godhead. There is no biblical doctrine of a metaphysical or ontological connection between Creator and creation, between Maker and creature. The connection is direct; it is made by the Holy Spirit, the divine executive. He touches the creation and the creature directly. Yet in this touching, in this work as executive, he does not originate the plans of his action, but he executes the plans of others. He acts with reference to something beyond himself. He is one who witnesses (John 15:26), and therefore the content of this witness exists "outside" himself. He is the gift of the Father to the Son and of the Son to the disciples; so he carries out the intentions of another" (Ramm, 30).

 2a. The witness of the Spirit and revelation (the Bible)

 The Spirit bears witness to the Word. They are not independent witnesses nor are they in competition.

 3a. The witness of the Spirit and redemption

 A work whereby the Spirit enables a person to recognize and respond to the truth of the Word about their need of salvation.

 4a. The witness of the Spirit and interpretation

Every believer sustains a relationship to the Holy Spirit. What is commonly called "illumination" is the benefit of regeneration in which the Spirit helps the believer to exercise the capacity to submit to the teaching of Scripture about ourselves and our world--i.e. that we might be interpreted by Scripture. The actual process of accessing the intended meaning of Scripture is the task of hermeneutics. The ability to expose this intended meaning depends upon the interpreter's skill in applying the science and art of hermeneutics and in his/her willingness to submit to what the Scriptures actually teach. The Spirit does not communicate content--either new or interpretive--to the interpreter, rather, the Spirit--in inexplicable ways--helps the interpreter to submit to the teaching which is being accessed while avoiding the imposition of a will/mind/emotion complex which avoids or distorts material into self-serving tracks.

Sources: In addition to looking at any/all systematic theologies and commentaries, cf.

Frame, John. "The Spirit and the Scriptures," in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon*. Edited by D.A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Zondervan, 1986).

Fuller, Daniel P. "The Holy Spirit's Role in Biblical Interpretation," in *Scripture, Tradition and Interpretation*. Edited by Ward Gasque and William LaSor (Eerdmans, 1978).

Janson, W. J. M. "The Guidance of the Spirit." *The Spirit in Biblical Perspective*, Edited by W. S. Vorster (Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1981).

**Klooster, Fred H.** "The Role of the Holy Spirit in the Hermeneutic Process: The Relationship of the Spirit's Illumination to Biblical Interpretation," in *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible* (Zondervan, 1984).

Mercer, Jerry L. "The Witness of the Spirit: A Doctrine in Tension", in *The Word and the Doctrine: Studies in Contemporary Wesleyan-Arminian Theology*, ed. by Kenneth E. Geiger (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1965).

**Kaiser, Walter C., Jr**. "A Neglected Text in Bibliology Discussions: 1 Corinthians 26-16." *Westminster Theological Journal* 43 (Spring 1981):301-319.

**Murray, John**. "The Guidance of the Holy Spirit." *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1976).

Owen, John. *The Works of John Owen*. Edited by William H. Goold (Reprint. The Banner of Truth Trust, [1850-53] 1967) 4.121-234.

Packer, J. I. "The Holy Spirit and His Work," *Crux* 23:2 (June 1987):2-17.

Preiss, Theo. "The Inner Witness of the Holy Spirit," *Interpretation* 7 (July 1953):260-280.

**Ramm, Bernard. *The Witness of the Spirit. An Essay on the Contemporary Relevance of the Internal Witness of the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959. [130pp.]**

Stuhlmacher, Peter. "The Hermeneutical Significance of 1 Cor 2:5-16." In *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne with Otto Betz. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Walker, William O., Jr. "1 Corinthians 2.6-16: A Non-Pauline Interpolation?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 47 (1992):75-94.

Williams, J. Rodman. *Renewal Theology: Salvation, the Holy Spirit, and Christian Living*, Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990).

 B. A key text in the discussion--1 Cor. 2:6-16

 See above discussion

 C. The affirmation of "led by the Spirit" in Romans 8:14 and Galatians 5:18

 Cf. B. B. Warfield, "The Leading of the Spirit." *Biblical and Theological Studies* (Reprint. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1952).

 D. The Upper Room Discourse of Jesus (John 14-17)

 1. Event and audience

 2. Key texts: 14:26; 16:13; cf. 15:26-27

 3. Key issues:

 1a. The determination of the extent of application of the assertions, i.e. restricted or unrestricted audience?

 2a. The exegesis of the key texts:

 E. The questions of 1 John 2:26-27

 1. What is the "anointing"?

 2. What is the meaning of "have no need that anyone teach you"?

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* END OF EPISTEMOLOGY INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

 2. Paul evaluates the problem of division as a problem of worldliness (3:1-4:21).

 1a. Paul affirms that division is the result of the Corinthians' worldly assessment of spiritual truth (3:1-4).

 1b. Paul declares that the Corinthians were not exercising their capacity to assimilate spiritual truth (3:1-2).

 2b. Paul describes the condition of the Corinthian believers (3:3-4).

 Consider the adjectives for “flesh”

 2a. Worldliness misunderstands the position of servants (3:5-15).

 1b. Paul delineates his and Apollos' position under God as servants and farmers (5-9). They are “functionaries” in God’s program.

Notice that Paul does not use the “disciple/teacher” analogy but the imagery of “servants” (cf. 4:1ff.).

 It is interesting to note how Paul progresses from "servants" (v. 5) to "God's fellow-workers" (v. 9).

 2b. Paul delineates the responsibility of the vocational

 worker by the analogy of a builder (vv.10-15)

 3a. Worldly division abuses the Church body (3:16-17).

 4a. Worldly division…by operating in a secular fashion…negates the reception and enjoyment of the fullness of God's provisions (3:18-23).

 5a. Worldly division abused God's ordained leadership (4:1-21). They are stewards of Christ rather than the end itself.

 1b. Paul reveals this aspect in his personal reflection (4:1-5).

4:2 is not about money (often on offering envelopes) but about ministry.

 2b. Paul chides the Corinthians for their arrogant independence (4:6-21).

 1c. Paul affirms that his self-application is actually a literary device to facilitate teaching the Corinthians (4:6-13).

 1d. Paul reveals his self-application as a teaching device (vv. 6-7).

4:6b “Do not go beyond what is written.” What does this proverbial saying mean? (See Fitzmyer, 215-216).

 2d. Paul reveals by self-application that the Corinthians, when compared to an apostle, had no basis for pride of place (vv. 8-13).

The paraphrase of this section by Dr. James Boyer, *For a World Like Ours*, cogently presents Paul's sarcasm.

8/So you are already fully stuffed. You are so soon become wealthy and high class. You have been crowned as kings in the full enjoyment of your place in Christ's kingdom, and that in spite of the fact that we have not. Ah! That's fine! That's splendid! I only wish it were true, for then we too might be able to share in your exaltation. 9/But I am sorry to say that we poor apostles haven't gone that far yet; for apparently God has put us apostles at the end of your victory procession, like those who are under the death sentence, to show us off as spectacles of shame to the world and to angels and men. 10/Our profession of Christ gets us branded as fools. For you, it means a reputation as wise men. We are sickly, you are strong. You have respect and honor, we have disgrace, contempt. 11/We go hungry and thirsty and without clothes on our backs, are slapped in the face, without a home, 12/ and we have to do manual labor. If anyone insults us we smile back sweetly at them. 13/We are just the dirt that decent people like you throw in the sewer (pp. 55-56).

 2c. Paul makes a personal appeal to the Corinthians as their spiritual father (4:14-21).

III. PAUL'S RESPONSE TO CERTAIN ORAL REPORTS/RUMORS (5:1-6:20 [5:1]).

**Section Summary:**

Possible Historical Nuances:

* 1 Cor 5-6 are a unit, responding to the “oral report” noted in 5:1.
* Good to read Garland’s beginning section summaries…well stated in synthesis.
* Plutarch’s *Moralia*, provides a source (45-125 CE) that condemns incest as a lawless act (cf. *Hellenistic Commentary*, 396ff.). Josephus (37-100 CE) also notes incest as an outrageous crime (*Antiq. 3.274).*

Josephus Antiq. 3:274   (3.12.1.274) As for adultery, Moses forbade it entirely, as esteeming it a happy thing that men should be wise in the affairs of wedlock; and that it was profitable both to cities and families that children should be known to be genuine. He also abhorred men’s lying with their mothers, as one of the greatest crimes; and the like for lying with the father’s wife, and with aunts, and sisters, and sons’ wives, as all instances of abominable wickedness. 275 (3.12.1.275) He also forbade a man to lie with his wife when she was defiled by her natural purgation; and not to come near brute beasts, nor to approve of the lying with a male, which was to hunt after unlawful pleasures on account of beauty. To those who were guilty of such insolent behavior, he ordained death for their punishment.

* Winter’s reconstruction of the incestuous man as one of high social status and that it would have been a breach of Roman societal ethics to publicly expose him as well as possible negative repercussions for members of the church.
* One possible dimension of this man’s status could be that of a “benefactor” to the assembly. If so, to offend him would undermine the church’s influence in the community and perhaps even invite hostility (cf. Garland, 163).
* Discuss Winter’s treatment of this event:

Contextual Structure:

* Chiasim? A Sexual Problem (Incest; 5:1-13)

 B Lawsuits (6:1-11)

 A’ Sexual Problem (Fornication; 6:12-20)

 [See Charles Talbert, *Reading Corinthians* (Crossroad, 1987)]

As you read 1 Cor 5-6, note how much emphasis is given to the community rather than just the individuals who are putting the community at risk. You “purge out the old leven” so the community can be pure; ***the community is a Temple of sacred space***.

* Thematic cohesion: A community full of strife, pride and greed, as evidenced by sexual and legal case studies. Paul appeals to “shame” (6:5), which in their culture would threaten their self-view of reputation, and to “vice catalogs” (5:9-11; 6:9-10) which has the same negative effect.

 A. Paul responds to the report concerning scandalous morality (ch. 5).

 1. Paul responds to the problem of incest (5:1-8).

 1a. Paul points out the fact of incest (5:1).

Reported as “Among you” points out that Paul is not just responding to the sin of one man, but to the sin of the church at Corinth.

The situation:

* the present inf. "have" implies a process rather than just one act. On “have his father’s wife” see Lev 18:8; 20:11; Deut 22:30; 27:20. Did marriage provide the church with an excuse not to act? Or, was action hampered by social structures?
* the options: 1/ living together on a regular basis; 2/ married? (cf. Jn 4:17 1 Cor 7:2, 12-13, 29; Gal 4:27).
* a practice worse than the heathen (Findley, *ExGkT*, p. 807; cf. Jewish law in Lev 18:8; Deut 24:1ff.; 27:20). Richard Hays (*First Corinthians*. John Knox Press, 1997) cites Cicero’s *Pro Cluentio* 5.14-6.15,

“And so mother-in-law marries son-in-law, with none to bless, none to sanction the union, and amid nought but general foreboding. Oh! to think of the woman’s sin, unbelievable, unheard of in all experience save for this single instance! To think of her wicked passion, unbridled, untamed! To think that she did not quail, if not before the vengeance of Heaven [Latin *vim deorum*, ‘the power of the gods’], or the scandal among men, at least before the night itself with its wedding torches, the threshold of the bridal chamber, her daughter’s bridal bed, or even the walls themselves which had witnessed that other union. **The madness of passion broke through and laid low every obstacle: lust triumphed over modesty, wantonness over scruple, madness over sense** [emphasis mine].”

Winter’s contribution to this scenario:

* Adultery and incest were treated in Roman **criminal** law (*After*, 46) and viewed as very serious violations, requiring punishing from exile to death.
* When Adultery and incest were involved, the Roman “statue of limitation’ (usually 5 years) did not apply (*After*, 46).
* Roman law favored persons of status. The right of prosecution was limited in Roman law, often favoring persons of status.
* Incest required a formal act of accusation in order to prosecute.

 2a. Paul bemoans the lack of repentance in light of this situation (5:2-8).

 1b. Paul calls for immediate and severe excommunication of the offender (5:2-5).

 1c. The Corinthian attitude (5:2).

 1d. The presence of pride (cf. Col 2:18)

Garland points out how the term (φυσιόω) in 5:2 translated as “proud” (ESV), “arrogant” (NIV) may serve as a “catch word” with 4:6, 18, 19 (cf. 8:1, 13:4) to provide continuation in his critique of the Corinthian problems.

In some sense, they were boasting about this situation. Was such arrogance related to the man’s social status (Winter, *After*, 53)?

 2d. The absence of mourning (5:2b)

The OT is clear about how sexual sins brought God’s judgment (cf. Jer 23:10). Paul follows up on this in 5:6-8.

 2c. Paul's call for discipline (5:3-5).

 1d. Paul delineates a three-fold involvement in this action: Paul, the Lord, and the church (5:3-4).

“When you are assembled” implies that the early Church observed and understood the structures it utilized to do business. The additions of “in the name of” and “in the power of” the Lord Jesus reflects to whom the Church is responsible and where power for action is derived.

Detailed interpretation of the text illustrates the importance of the placement of punctuation. Modern translations tend to insert full stops (periods) in order to break up long sentences. 1 Cor 5:3-5 is actually one sentence. In Greek, grammatical units (phrases, dependent clauses, etc.) may be placed in a variety of sequences. English requires a rather fixed sequence, making modification dependent upon placement. But Greek is not English and often leaves open where modifiers are placed. Therefore, translation requires interpretation! An illustration of this is what the prepositional phrase “in the name of our Lord Jesus” (5:4) modifies.

Note how the English versions below render this paragraph:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **KJV** | **NRSV** | **NIV** | **NLT** |
| For I verily, as absent in body but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath done this deed, **in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ**, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan…. | For though absent in body, I am present in spirit; and as if present I have already pronounced judgment **in the name of the Lord Jesus** on the man who has done such a thing. When you are assembled, and my spirit is present with the power of our Lord Jesus, you are to hand this man over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, so that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord. | Even though I am not physically present, I am with you in spirit. And I have already passed judgment on the one who did this, just as if I were present. When you are assembled **in the name of our Lord Jesus** and I am with you in spirit, and the power of our Lord Jesus is present, hand this man over to Satan….(TNIV goes with NRSV !!) | Even though I am not there with you in person, I am with you inn the Spirit. Concerning the one who has done this, I have already passed judgment **in the name of the Lord Jesus**. You are to call a meeting of the church, and I will be there in spirit, and the power of the Lord Jesus will be with you as you meet. then you must cast this man out of the church and into Satan’s hands…. |

Evaluate the placement of this phrase in the above translations:

 KJV
 NRSV
 NIV
 NLT

Does translation make a difference ? !

Now let’s review the “validation” by Thiselton’s commentary (pp. 393-394; see insert; cf. Kistemaker’s comm. and TMSJ 3.1 [1992]:33-45) and see how the placement of a prepositional phrase can image our understanding of a text! Thiselton notes 6 options in interpretive history concerning where to connect this phrase:

* Variations of “in…” with the assembled congregation

 a/ “in…” goes with gen. abs. “assembled…” (Origen, Chrysostom, etc.)

 b/ with “assembled” but to construe power “to deliver” (5:5) (Heinrici, Lietzmann)

 c/ with “assemble” connected to “with power” (Calvin, Erasmus, Rosner)

* d/ “in…” modifies “to consign/deliver” of 5:5 (Ambrosiaster, Mosheim)
* e/ “in…” governs remaining clauses of 5:4-5 (Luther, Bengel, Allo)
* f/ “in…” modifies “I have already judged” of 5:3

 “Such is the length of this single convoluted sentence in vv. 3-5 that it is difficult to argue for one view over another. With this caveat, however, we concluded that (e) has most to commend it on the grounds of its status as a speech-act, while (c) also remains convincing as seriously possible, and none (except perhaps [f]) can be excluded with certainty” (Thiselton, commentary, 394).

Another view, however, is noted by Garland as gaining acceptance: that the “in…” phrase modifies the man’s action, “the one who did this in the name of our Lord Jesus.” this rendition actually

maintains the natural order of the Greek. Garland himself rejects this view but the idea that this man was bold in claiming a new ideology/theology is becoming more common. Reconstruction of this text in light of Roman elitism makes such a bold assertion possible.

 2d. Paul states the awesome nature of discipline (5:5).

 1e. The realm of discipline -- "deliver to Satan"

 2e. The explanation of discipline.

 1f."destruction of the flesh"

 2f."That the spirit may be saved..."

EXPANSION OF NOTES ON 1 Cor. 5:5

1e. The realm of discipline -- "deliver to Satan"

 1f. phrase usage:

* This exact phrase is only elsewhere in 1 Tim 1:20 (cf. 2 Tim 2:17-18; 4:14-15). It seems that the plain meaning of the phrase in Cor. and Tim. = excommunication - cf. 1 Cor 5:2, 7, 13. Satan as an agent of God occurs in other situations as well (cf. 2 Cor 12:7; Job).
* Correlation with Greek and/or Qumran curse formula? (cf. Collins
* In what sense does Satan figure into this?

 To be outside the domain of the Church is to be in Satan's domain:

 Eph 2:12

 Col 1:13

 1 Jn 5:19

 Jn 12:31; 16:11

 Acts 26:18

This is not a “Hello Satan, Heeeeeerrrrrsssss Johnny!” (Pun on former Johnny Carson late night show introduction). Rather, Satan’s realm is that which is outside the circle of the church (or, out from under the “umbrella”). In the circle there is God’s protection and care, but outside the circle one is vulnerable. This is not an issue of salvation, but an issue of discipline that is designed to bring an erring believer to see the error of their way.

 2f. phrase significance:

 -- it is a phrase of excommunication

“the new community rested upon the preliminary defeat of Satan by Jesus (see 15:24-27; Phil 2:10f.; Col 2:15). To be excluded [i.e. excommunicated] from the sphere in which Christ’s work was operative was to be thrust back into that which [the realm where] Satan still exercised authority” (J.N.D. Kelly, 126).

 -- this excommunication may be accompanied by a supernatural demonstration of judgment

 e.g. Acts 5:1-10

 13:8-11

2e. The explanation of discipline -- "dest. of flesh" (objective genitive); save spirit

 1f. "dest. of flesh" -- question involves sig. of "flesh": body or sinful nature

ESV: “…deliver this man to Satan for (εἰς) the destruction of the flesh…”

NIV: “…hand this man over to Satan so that the sinful nature may be destroyed…”

 1g. Individual body view, curse/death (traditional view;

 Conzelmann, Kasemann, Barrett, Morris, Lampe):

 destruction = sickness and even death

This view is based on “flesh” referring to the physical body, which is turned over to Satan with a formula analogous to “curse” formula found in Qumran texts and Magical papyri. The physical punishment, consignment to death, is viewed as remedial, salvaging the person for the eschaton.

Garland criticizes this view in detail:

* the parallel texts are not the same kind of context

 cf. 1 Cor 11:30 - phy. consequen. of spiritual failings
Acts 5:1-10
Job 2:5
2 Cor 12:7

* the claimed curse texts are not true parallels. Paul may actually have influenced the later magical texts.
* the later rabbinic idea that suffering and death actually expiates past sins is contrary to Paul’s message of the cross.

In ancient culture, ostracism from “the group” was very serious. Merging into a new group would not be natural. It was not like today when one can just move to the church across town with no questions asked! This could cause great stress and self reflection about actions.

 2g. Corporate body view

A statement of expulsion of the man from the community, and thus into Satan’s realm, in order to purge the leaven from the group (cf. 5:2, 7, 13; cf. 5:9-13). Sexual sins are not private matters.

* This view accounts for Paul addressing the group rather than the individual.
* The OT teaches exclusion to expulsion for the sake of the purity of the whole (cf. Deut 13:6-11; 17:2-7, 12-13; 19:19-20; 21:18-21; cf. 1 Tim 5:20).
* “Putting the man outside the sphere of God’s protection makes him vulnerable to satanic forces (cf. Eph 2:12; Co 1:13; 1 John 5:19), from which Christians have been rescued (Col 1:13; Acts 26:18)” (Garland, 173).
* The “flesh” is a metaphor for the sinful nature [sinful orientation] (NIV; Fee; cf. Thiselton’s comm. and SJT 26 [May 1973]:204-228; J. South NTS 39 [Oct 1993]:539-560): Destroy sinful lusts that caused the problem and thereby cause the person to repent (Gal 3:13; 5:13, 16-26; 6:8; Rom 8:3-18; Col 3:5). The flesh in this setting is “the sin-bent self characterized by self-sufficiency that wages war against God” (Garland, 175). This sinful nature is to be “put to death” as part of the sanctifying process. When we fail to do that as a pattern of life, we need extra motivation to do so.
* But, no mention of repentance in context as goal, although surely assumed.
* It seems odd to have Satan as the instrument to cause repentance (Garland cites 2 Cor 12:8-10 as an illustration…but he denied such parallels in his critique of the death view!).

 3g. Consider a more wholistic understanding?

Western interpretation tends to “pigeon hole” toward one exclusive understanding. The

Bible does not bifurcate the physical and spiritual as Western culture does. Perhaps all of the above could have been in Paul’s mind.

 2f. "that" the spirit may be saved" (a real purpose clause)

* “It is not clear how the destruction of the physical side of man's nature can effect the salvation of the immaterial side" (Barre). The death view has to view this as the final eschaton. It could reflect 1 Cor 3:15 in principle (man's essential self saved but no reward).
* The person’s repentance is the goal of discipline.

 3e. The status of the person disciplined -- Was this man a believer or an unbeliever?

The answer to this question is influenced by interp. of details of 5:5.

Was the person in 1 Cor 5 the same as 2 Cor 2:5-11? Also, if it is the same person, did he respond to Paul’s critique? Garland on 2 Cor (*Am Bible Comm*) argues that he did not respond but sought support against Paul’s authority.

**\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* END OF INSERT \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \***

 2b. Paul illustrates the seriousness of entertaining such sin (5:6-8).

In this paragraph Paul uses the imagery of leaven to unpack their sinful “boasting,” a boasting that reflects a “disingenuous attitude influenced by status” (*After*, 55). He pulls in the Passover imagery to stimulate the ideas of purging out sin and basic obedience to divine will. The appeal to these Jewish ideas and the list in 5:11 implies the presence of persons in Corinth who understood these nuances, namely Jews.

Paul’s rhetorical use of “do you not know” (5:6; 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19; cf. 3:16; 9:13, 14) deflates arrogance and assumed intelligence. The massive repetition of this phrase would certain ring in the ears of those who heard the text read aloud. Furthermore, most of what they do not know relates to the moral expectations of the gospel. Consequently, they have lost reputation and thus status among the saints, a clever criticism in light of elitism tendencies.

 2. Paul reminds the Corinthians about the need to sever fellowship with immoral brothers (5:9-13).

 1a. Paul's former teaching in this domain had apparently been misunderstood (5:9-11).

Hays observes (p. 88) that the list in 5:11 may reflect exclusion texts in Deuteronomy that drive toward the exclusion statement in 5:13, “Expel the wicked man from among you” (NIV). The parallels are more thematic than intertextual.

 1 Corinthians 5:11 Deuteronomy

 Sexually immoral promiscuity, adultery (22:21-22, 30)
 Greedy (no parallel, but paired with ‘robbers’ in 5:9)
 Idolater idolatry (13:1-5; 17:2-7)
 Reviler malicious false testimony (19:16-19)
 Drunkard rebellious drunken son (21:18-21)
 Robber kidnaping, slave-trading (24:7; LXX uses “thief”)

 2a. Paul clarifies the domain of the church's responsibility (5:12-13).

What are the implications of Paul’s “not outside” but “inside” judgmental focus?

* it does not negate pronouncing judgment on sin (cf. Rom 1)
* it does imply “boundaries” on the church’s authority and control
* it does not relate to contemporary issue of legal/political involvement (e.g. whether a moral majority kind of organization can be formed)

**III. PAUL'S RESPONSE TO CERTAIN ORAL REPORTS/RUMORS (5:1-6:20 [5:1]).**

 **A. Paul responds to the report concerning scandalous morality (5:1-13).**

 **B. Paul responds to the report concerning unrighteous litigation (6:1-11).**

**OVERVIEWING THE CONTEXT … Literary and historical**

**Deming’s article** (JBL 115 [1996]:289-312) argues that chs. 5-6 are a unified **literary unit** around a “legal struggle among the Corinthians over the sexual misconduct in 5:1” (289). This means that the court setting in 6:1-11 and the sexual issues of 6:12-20 reflect on this macro issue. Thus the text issues of chs. 5-6 are unified.

**Winter’s chapters** focus on a **larger historical reconstruction** of courts in Roman Corinth.

How could Paul be so negative about judges/courts in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 and so supportive in Romans 13:1-7? Primarily because Romans is addressing the government’s role in controlling criminal violations while 1 Corinthians is reflecting on civil courts (6:2 “judge trivial cases”). Civil courts were more locally controlled with all of the local politics and corruption that comes with that territory. In the civil domain, the methodology of legal process was vicious…to prevail you had to assault the opponent’s character. This came to be known as **“vexacious litigation.”**

* **Civil courts** dealt with: legal possession, breach of contract, damages, fraud, injury, and seemingly dealt with issues in regard to disputes in “organizations” (associations, ἐκκλησίαι).
* **Criminal courts** dealt with: high treason, embezzlement of state property, bribery at elections, extortion in the provinces, murder by violence or poisoning, endangering of public security, forgery of wills or coins, violent offences, adultery and seduction of reputable unmarried women (Winter, *Seek*, 107).
* **Judges and Jurors in civil courts**.
* Roman litigation in civil courts favored those of **status** (elite class). Judges were elected only from the elite class and held sway over those of lesser status; Jurors were appointed in relation to their financial status and were intimidated by persons of status, especially those who were their benefactors.
* The courts protected those of status from being “**shame**d” by a person of less status. Lawsuits could not be initiated by persons of lower status and were basically conducted among persons who were social equals.
* Judges and Jurors were often **corrupt** (See Winter’s original source citations, which include illustrations of abuse and illustrations that even Rome was concerned about the system).
* Furthermore, in the civil domain, the methodology of legal process was vicious. Lawyers were particularly trained in oratory and to prevail you had to assault the opponent’s character. This came to be known as **“vexatious litigation.”** Winning often meant causing shame and loss of dignity for the plaintiff.

For details see:

Garnsey, Peter. *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1970.

Winter, Bruce. *After Paul Left Corinth*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001; and *Seek the Welfare of the City.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Reflect further on Winter’s portrayal of litigation in a Roman setting:

* Winter notes how Roman litigation favored those of status (Judges were elected only from the elite class and held sway over those of lesser status; Jurors were appointed in relation to their financial status and were intimidated by persons of status, especially those who were their benefactors).
* The courts protected those of status from being “shamed” by a person of less status (law suits could not be initiated by persons of lower status and were basically conducted among persons who were social equals).
* Judges and Jurors were often corrupt (See Winter’s original source citations, which include illustrations of abuse and illustrations that Rome was concerned about the system).

A surviving papyrus from Nero’s reign (A.D. 54-67) cites a case where prosecution was impossible because a person of status had a track record of winning cases by favorable impartial Jurors (*After*, 62). Seneca cites the case of a man of status taunting a lower status person to sue him and the poor man knew it was useless (*After*, 63).

Winter (*After*, 61) cites three witnesses in regard to the Corinthian courts: “Dio Chrysostom records c. A.D. 89-96 that there were in Corinth ‘lawyers innumerable twisting judgements’ [Or. 8.9; 7.123]. A decade later Favorinus refers to the unjust treatment which he had received at the hands of leading Corinthian citizens. He contrasts that with the actions of their forefathers in pre-Roman days who were themselves ‘lovers of justice’ (filodi/kaioi) and shown to be ‘pre-eminent among the Greeks for cultivating justice’. Those in Roman Corinth were obviously not. Later, in the second century, Apuleius inveighs against the Corinthians, alleging that ‘nowadays all juries sell their judgements for money’ [*Metamorphoses or The Golden Ass* 9.33].”

* Furthermore, in the civil domain, the methodology of legal process was vicious…to prevail you had to assault the opponent’s character. This came to be known as “vexacious litigation.” Winning often meant causing shame and loss of dignity for the plantiff.
* At the end of the day, Corinthian Christians of status may have been using the public courts and/or the principles of Roman “vexatious litigation to adjudicate their dealings with one another in the Christian community” (74), or they may have been dealing with each other internal to the church in the same way the pagan society operated.

**WALKING THROUGH THE TEXT**

 **1. Paul points out the shame and incompatibility of pursuing litigation in worldly courts (6:1-6).**

Because of the unity of 1 Cor 5-6, Deming has argued that 6:1-11 is actually a court case relating to 5:1-8 (see *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 [1996]:289-312). He argues that some in the congregation, irate at the issue of incest, took the son/husband to civil court but lost the case. He also sees 6:12-20 reflecting on the event in ch. 5. These conflicts divided the community and were a continuing problem.

While an interesting scenario on reflecting how to maintain the unity of a context, Gagnon asserts that this reconstruction fails for at least three reasons:

“While I find Deming’s arguments intriguing, the notion that the lawsuit in 6:1-8 has to do with the incestuous man fails on three counts. **First**, who would Paul encourage the Corinthian believers to be “wronged” and “defrauded” (6:7-8), that is, to let the matter drop *within* the Christian community and not just in the courts? Paul himself has already urged the community to expel the incestuous man. **Second**, Paul’s claim in 5:1 that the case of incest is a kind of sexual immorality found not even among the gentiles would have been undermined if the courts had taken no action. **Third**, Paul refers to this lawsuit in question as an example of “the least (most insignificant, trivial) cases” (6:2) and “everyday/ordinary matters” (6:3), unlikely characterizations of incest” (p. 292, note 63).

In regard to 6:12-20, Gagnon does agree with Deming that it is a general reflection relating to the incest in ch. 5.

**6:1** “*Dare…*go before the unrighteous” – Paul’s opening term accuses the Corinthians of “brazen insolence” (Garland, 195). Who are the “unrighteous”?

* Some view the unrighteous of 6:1 to be the same as the unbelievers of 6:6. They do not see Paul making a moral judgment about the courts, but merely that believers should deal with matters “in house”.
* Others view Paul’s reference to unrighteous as a judgment about the Roman judicial process.

Winter argues that “unrighteous” is a valid description about the judges and the juries of adjudicated legal complaints (review 61ff.).

**6:1** Paul’s use of the term τῶν ἀδίκων (ASV, unrighteous; NIV, ungodly) is probably more than just saying that the civil judges were unbelievers (the normal term is in 6:6). He is indicting the judicial process they represent as well as noting that they are “outside” (cf. 5:12-13) the realm of the “righteous” (insiders). See Garland (197), Winter and others for references to primary sources that demean the legal culture of their time.

**6:2** – “trivial cases” (ESV) To view these as a “small claims” kind of court is to read

Western categories into ancient culture. 6:2 is more likely a reference to “vexatious litigation” which was more a part of **civil court rather than the more serious level of criminal court.** This was the use of courts to address enmity between parties. It was the use of courts to address personal problems in the society. Other levels of law/courts were used for the more typical legal problems (breach of contract, personal physical injury, property damage, fraud, etc.). So terms like “strife,” “jealousy,” “carnality,” “envy,” fall into Judges and juries dealing with personal battles (e.g. political slander, leadership battles, status control). Power struggles within groups were played out in court.

“The civil courts by convention provided another appropriate arena to conduct a power struggle within the church as it would in any association. The same struggle had moved from the meetings of the Christian community to a session of the civil court.” (Winter, 66)

These kind of proceedings, with the allowable judicial process which approached slandering plaintiffs in court, created great “personal resentment and loss of dignity for the defendant” (66).

**6:4** is tricky to translate (literal: participle from ἐξουθενέω = BDAG, despised, of no account. Cf. Garland, 204ff.). This text illustrates how something as seemingly simple as punctuation can be an issue of validation (see Garland, 204-207). The second clause verb may be either an assertion (indicative mood) or an imperative.

* assertion in the form of a question (verb as indicative, see ASV; ESV)
* exclamation (verb as indicative, “you are appointing…!”)
* exclamation (verb as an imperative, see NIV)
* **Taking the verb as an indicative/interrogative** (ESV, RSV, NRSV, NASB, UBS4, Luther, Fee, Thiselton probably)

 ESV: “So if you have such cases, ‘why do you lay them before *those who have no
 standing* in the church?’ [verb as indicative; implies secular judges/jurors]

In these translations, the ESV is more dynamic than the NIV! Interestingly, the ESV’s interpretive translation matches Winter’s analysis: “It would seem that the reference to those of no account in the Christian ‘meeting’ was to the outsider, i.e., the judge and the jury who presided over civil actions. They had no ‘status’ in the Christian family, even though there were Christians who were all too conscious of the importance and the deference that should be given to their civic status as annually elected magistrates and jurors.” (70)

* **Taking the verb as an imperative** (KJV, NIV, Chrysostom, Augustine, and many modern writers, Garland)

 NIV: “Therefore, if you have disputes about such matters, appoint as judges even
 *men of little account* in the church!” [verb as imperative; sarcasm for internal appointment]

 The phrase “men of little account” (NIV) means those of low social status (not a

term of morality). It probably implies the undermining of using courts to advance status. I am drawn to the sarcasm since it fits the context and Pauline style (see Garland’s list of reasons).

**6:5** Paul’s statement in 6:5, “I say this to your shame,” has deep cultural ramifications.
 Those who were using worldly means to deal with personal problems were the ones
 who suffered “loss of dignity” (*dignitas*). In a culture of shame, this is a major
 judgmental statement.

 **EXCURSUS on “shame” (6:5)**

* Noun in 6:5 is ἐντροπή, “shame, humiliation,” and only occurs here and 1 Cor 15:34 in the NT. In extra-biblical literature, it can be used for the opposite, “respect, regard.” Its verb form (ἐντρέπω) is used slightly more in the NT and means “shame” (only in 1 Cor 4:14; 2 Thess 3:14; Titus 2:8) in its negative use.
* Its semantic field, however, is much larger (Louw and Nida, 25.189-202).
* A “culture of shame” cannot simply be unpacked by words but requires a conceptual level explanation (as Winter et.al. do).

Paul’s statements imply that the Church should be able to care for its internal problems with due process and binding authority. Have you ever known a church that has a “Grievance Committee” or a fair and reasonable process to adjudicate complaints?

It needs to be emphasize that since this context is focused on “vexatious litigation,” it is not, therefore, to be widely applied as a prohibition for every kind of litigation. Whether litigation in our cultural setting is appropriate, needs to be decided on a case-by-case basis. Today’s courts would rarely get involved in adjudicating personal power disputes.

Winter concludes that the methodology of “vexatious litigation” was being used by persons of status *within* the Church’s gatherings and that the external courts were an analogy for their behavior (73-74). It was the Church acting like its world.

 **2. Paul points out that the lawsuits are merely symptomatic of deeper problems, or moral defect (6:7-8).**

A believing community in harmony should render lawsuits to deal with personal animosity non-existent. To need formal litigation between believers in this regard is a confession of moral failure (6:7, “defeat” ἥττημα). This moral failure is the inability to operate according to biblical values. Remember…this command was given within a culture whose structures obviously made it difficult to live biblically.

Some preliminary conclusions:

* Comparisons between Roman and USA courts is more on the basis of analogy than identity.
* Issues in 1 Cor 6 probably related to civil rather than criminal law. So,

whatever analogy exists, this is the arena…human disputes not criminal activity.

* Roman courts operated along the lines of status. USA courts are designed to be fair and not relate to status (other than buyer better lawyers).
* US Courts are, by virtue of our society, essential in many ways (e.g. to establish disputed property boundaries, divorce equity, custody of children, integrity in performance-for-pay in goods and services and many business ventures, insurance companies dealing with issues that pertain to you without your permission!). While “justice” may be influenced by money-for-skill representation, and character is often assaulted as part off the process, it is still not a social status vexacious litigation context.
* Paul’s exhortation that we are better wronged than embarrass the assembly still has to be given due consideration (6:7-8). As Garland notes, even pagans valued that “a wise man ignores injury” (cf. Garland’s notation of Seneca, p. 208). At the same time, we must not assume this is a prescriptive text in light of the different cultures and court systems.

 **3. Paul appeals to the Christian's position in Christ as a reason for better behavior (6:9-11; See Winter, *After*, 110-119).**

**Vice list (6:9-10):** Unrighteous (ἄδικοι)
[cf. ch. 5:11] sexually immoral (πόρνοι)
 idolaters (εἰδωλολάτραι)
 adulterers (μοιχοὶ)
 homosexuality (μοιχοὶ οὔτε μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται see
 Garland in.loc. where these two terms are defined.)

At this point, two terms emerge that are highly debated in the homosexual discussions. Note how the English versions interpret these terms. E.g., the ESV combines them as a unit while the NIV represents that there are two terms (making the ESV more dynamic on this occasion!).

 KJV: “nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind”
 ESV: “nor men who practice homosexuality”
 NIV: “nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders”
 WINTER: “nor passive homosexuality nor active homosexuality”
 HORSLEY et.al.: “nor masturbators nor male prostitutes”

Winter notes the collation of these two terms in light of Roman usage and observes that μοιχοὶ / malakoi comes from the Latin *malacus* and may represent a homosexual act that was not permitted under Roman law, namely the penetration of a male Roman citizen (see Winter, *After*, 110-119). In this case, Paul prohibits two levels of homosexuality and undermines a Roman law permission (the penetration of non-Roman males was allowed in the mores of the elite status).

Winter shows how the first term developed to represent the **passive** homosexual (p. 116-117) and that the coined second term (developed from the LXX of Lev 18:22; 20:13) represented **active** homosexuality. As you can see, these terms are a major validation project.

For an **elaborate treatment of homosexual issues** in today’s culture with, see **Robert A. J. Gagnon**, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001 [see his website: [www.robgagnon.net](http://www.robgagnon.net)]. For a treatment that reflects how some biblical scholars frame it as a choice, see L. William Countryman, *Dirt, Greed and Sex: Sexual Ethics in the New Testament and Their Implications for Today*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988; Robin Scroggs. *The New Testament and Homosexuality: Contextual Background for Contemporary Debate*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

The list continues….

 thieves
 greedy
 drunkards
 revilers
 swindlers

But… washed / sanctified / justified [Order of this triad?]

 **C. Paul evaluates the foundational principle that causes the problems of disorder in the body (6:12-20).**

Review the possible chiastic structure (Support Deming?):

 A Sexual Problem (Incest; 5:1-13)
 B Lawsuits (6:1-11)
 A’ Sexual Problem (Fornication; 6:12-20)
 [See Charles Talbert, *Reading Corinthians* (Crossroad, 1987)]

This last paragraph in chs. 5-6 dovetails with the beginning of ch. 5. The content is clearly about illicit sex. But what does this mean in context? Is the problem

* merely a matter of creative rationalism for sexual licentiousness on the part of certain Corinthian men, claiming that “all things are lawful” for them,
* or is it once again tied to the special rationalizations of the “elite” and their exercise of the liberty of status? (Winter, *After*, ch. 5)
* could it be a reflection of the incest of the son with his step mother?
* or is it a transition paragraph connecting the oral reports of 5-6 with the written questions of 7:1ff.? (See Garland’s summary of Hurd, pp. 220-222)

Garland’s work often lacks adequate engagement with the reconstructions of Winter. This could be related to the timing of publication (Garland’s 2003 date, probably submitted over a year before and actually written in the late 1990s, and 2003 could have been the end of 2002 since publishers sometimes anticipate the coming year…so Winter’s work was relatively new).

The moral teaching of this paragraph transcends historical particularity, but knowing what historical context exists assists in connecting the details of the text.

 **1. Paul's citation and critique of what seems to be a Corinthian slogan (6:12).**

 1a. Translation

 ESV NIV

“All things are lawful for me,” "Everything is permissible for me" --
 but not all things are helpful. but not everything is beneficial.
“All things are lawful for me,” "Everything is permissible for me" --
 but I will not be enslaved but I will not be mastered by anything.
 by anything.

Compare Paul’s reference to the same issue in 10:23:

“All things are lawful,” “Everything is permissible,”--

but not all things are helpful. but not everything is beneficial.

“All things are lawful,” “Everything is permissible,”

but not all things build up. but not everything is constructive.

 2a. Explication

**1b. The aphoristic slogan:**

 1 Cor 6:12 (x2) – “All things are lawful for me” [Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν]
 1 Cor 10:23 (x2) – “All things are lawful” [Πάντα ἔξεστιν]
 The verb may be translated “it is lawful or permitted.” For idea of "permit" cf. Acts
 21:37; 2 Cor 12:4.

Murrphy-O’Connor also claims 6:18b, “Every sin that a man commits is outside the body,” as a slogan to justify internal purity apart from external purity.

 1c. **Is Paul quoting and critiquing a general slogan** of freedom that the

 Corinthians were using **as an abstract principle**? This would mean that Paul is

 using the Corinthians' maxim/slogan as a rhetorical device?

If this is the case, then our tension is to explain how Paul could be soft with their idea that “everything is lawful.” It would be assumed that the context of "everything" is limited to those areas not stipulated by moral precepts from God and that Paul is tempering Christian freedom against loving self-restriction for the good of others.

This explanation is a common reading among NT exegetes (cf. Fee). As Garland states, “the prevailing view is that the maxim [i.e. slogan] ‘all things are permissible to me’ was used by the Corinthian freethinkers to sanction their immoral behavior” (225-226), although he goes on to reject the view. He explains the text the same without the slogan idea driving it.

Along with this read is the idea that 6:12-20 is Paul’s criticism of Corinthian slackness toward consort with prostitutes, however justified in their cultural context.

After reading works like Winter, it seems to me that many commentaries on this and probably other parts of the NT, reveal the complete lack of the commentator’s knowledge of the Graeco-Roman world. It seems that most NT scholars in the evangelical movement naturally gravitate to Jewish backgrounds, but when that dynamic is not present, they default to a “surface” reading of the text (cf. e.g. the recent IVP Dict of NT Background…no real feel for Graeco-Roman background beyond the obvious level).

 2c. **Or, is Paul denying the validity of the aphorism?** Winter’s reconstruction calls for this understanding.

Winter comments, “The idea must be reflected that the maxim of the secular elite that ‘[for me] all things are permitted’ (which some Corinthian Christians espoused) was part of an ill-thought-out Pauline *paradosis* [=exhortation]. Paul himself emphatically rejected the aphorism which he twice cited with the use of the strong adversative ἀλλά [= “but”] (6:12; 10:23).” (105; cf. 81)

Winter’s argument asserts:

 1d. There was a small but significantly influential group of the “socially
 elite” (= “the wise”) among the Corinthian Christians (p. 106; cf. 1:26; 3:18; 6:5; 6:12-20; 8:9-10; 15:12 with 15:32-34)

 2d. The Roman socially elite rationalized a “two-tier system of ethical
 behaviour.” This was grounded in their Platonic worldview that “the body is
 said to have been ordained for pleasure and that the immortal soul was
 unaffected by any such conduct” (88).

 3d. Persons of social status were “permitted” (the very verb Paul uses is
 well attested in Graeco-Roman literature) this dual ethic after about the age
 of about eighteen when they were conferred with the Roman *toga virilis*
 (89). On one hand, this ceremony was passage to legal adulthood, but on the
 other, it was a ticket to the sociology of the elite in the Roman Banquet
 setting (cf. Roman *convivium*). Winter notes numerous sources that depict
 these banquets as “eating, drinking, and lovemaking.” Eat to the point of
 gluttony, drink to drunkenness and fornication with professional women
 (see. pp. 90ff.). The *toga virilis* was the passage to the “right” to make
 decisions about participating in these events.

 4d. Winter correlates this Roman Banquet background with a number of
 words and phrases Paul uses in 6:12-20.

Roman Banquets had a threefold theme: Eating, drinking and loving. For details about these banquets see:

 Dunbabin, Katherine M. D. *The Roman Banquet: Images of Conviviality*.
 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Juvenal commented that the Roman Banquet fostered “a degree of decadence associated not only with the pleasure of the palate but also of the pillow” (*Satire*, 14.7-10).

Plutarch, *Moralia* II.140.16 (Loeb’s)

 **Phrases to consider:**

“all things are permitted” (6:12)

“food is meant for the stomach and the stomach for food”—but God will destroy both….” (6:13)

“the body is not meant for sexual immorality….” (6:13)

“your bodies are members of Christ….[not] members of a prostitute” (6:15)

“flee from sexual immorality…sins against his own body.” (6:18)

“body is a temple of the Holy Spirit….” (6:19)

 Think about how community is the focus in chs. 5-6, not the individual!

**If Winter’s reconstruction is correct, then 6:12-20 has more to do with the Banquet than the Brothel (although, the brothel came to the banquet!).**

**2b. Paul's two negotiations.**

The answer stanzas to “all things are permitted” seem calm compared to what this phrase may have meant. But when one understands how Paul in 6:12-20 undermines the philosophical tenants of the dualistic ethic of the elite, it becomes clear that Paul was representing a major clash in worldviews.

 1c. "not expedient" = not beneficial, profitable, advantageous (BAGD, 780).

συμφέρω, verb, “benefit” - cf. 10:23; 12:7; 2 Cor. 8:10; 12:1

In 1 Cor, “what is beneficial primarily relates to what benefits others” (Garland, 229). cf. the noun in 10:33; 12:7; 7:35; 2 Cor 8:10; 12:1

"Christian freedom [but not the point here] must be limited by regard for others" (Barrett). cf. Gal. 5:13; 1 Pet. 2:16

At the least, Paul is after a change in worldview. The Corinthians’ were used to exercising

dual ethics, especially in sexual domains. Paul is making it clear that there is no room in Christianity for any deviation from a singular sexual ethic.

 2c. "I will not be enslaved by anything" (6:12)

Paul plays on the sound of the Greek words “are permitted” and “will not be overpowered.”

We might paraphrase this as: **“I’m not going to be a victim of the dictum!”**

 πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπό τινος.

 **2. Paul delineates a Christian view of the "body" (sw√ma) (6:13-20).**

 1a. Paul affirms that the authority over the physical body rests with God/Biblical revelation (6:13-14).

The lens of Winter’s reconstruction reads these phrases as supportive of reading Paul as criticizing the assumed Roman duality of body and spirit in sexual activities. The reference to food and *porneia* (fornication; sexual immorality) correlates with the abuse that those with status practiced in the Roman Banquet setting.

Is love making a beautiful and mutually pleasurable act? Then how can it ever be wrong? The only answer is that God has revealed the context in which it is either acceptable/beautiful or ugly/out-of-bounds.

Paul’s theme of “body” in 6:13-20 slams the Platonic anthropology that bifurcates body pleasures and the soul. For Paul, the deeds of the body are a window to the soul. This issue is revisted in 1 Cor 15.

 2a. Paul describes the nature of the sacredness of the body within God's perspective (6:15-20).

The Greek structure of 6:15-20 is framed around three questions introduced with the rhetorical device “do you not know that…” (ou˙k oi¡date o¢ti…). The plural form of “you” throughout this section indicates that Paul is speaking to the Church as a unit although its individual units determine the whole.

Once again, the data that Winter provides about Platonic anthropology is devastated by Paul’s view of the body.

 1b. The body is sacred in its connection to God (6:15).

Paul’s response to the two questions of 6:15 is as strong as he can be, “may it never be” (μὴ γένοιτα, cf. Rom 6:1).

 2b. The body is violated by wrong connections (6:16-18).

 2b. The body is violated by wrong connections (6:16-18).

Paul’s applies the marriage idea of “two become one body” to increase the seriousness of sexual sin. The sexual union and its exchange of fluids physically and forensically creates a new union. Even modern science notes that sex partners are forever affected as a result of this exchange.

The dictum that “every sin a man commits…” merely reflects the seriousness of sexual union violations. It is a sin that has forensic ramifications. The phrase also supports a non-bifurcating view of material and non-material (part of Paul’s anti-Platonic tone).

 3b. The body is the “temple” of God's Spirit (6:19-20).

What does this metaphor mean?

How does it serve the context of 1 Cor 5-6?

There is certainly a lot of thematic unity in the flow of material in 1 Cor 5ff. Even as we move into ch. 7, the sexual issues persist.

**IV. Paul’s Response to a Written communique from Corinth (7:1-16:4; cf. 7:1)**

**Introductory Matters**

**1. Overview**: The majority of 1 Cor is given to Paul’s response to a number of questions/issues in the community (Note 7:1). These include:

 Marriage and sex (ch. 7)
 Food offered to idols (chs. 8-10)
 Church order and gender (ch. 11)
 Spiritual gifts (chs. 12-14)
 The resurrection of humans (ch. 15)
 The collection of funds for ministry (ch. 16)

**2. Reflecting on the organization of 1 Cor 7**

Charles Talbert’s organization of this chapter is structurally compelling (see *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. New York: Crossroad, 1987).

**Talbert** notes the marker Paul often uses in 1 Cor is “now concerning” (Περὶ δὲ). This marker occurs in 7:1, 7:25, 8:1, 12:1, 16:1 and 16:12. Although this marker does not always occur to flag another question/challenge from the Corinthian community.

Using these markers and observing the paragraphs, 1 Cor 7 yields (see Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*):

 A. Paul **responds** to issues of sex and marriage (7:1-24)

 1. Marriage realities…normative and sexual not celibate (7:1-7)

 1a. The introductory marker (7:1a)
 2a. The question/slogan (7:1b)
 3a. Paul’s evaluation of the issue (7:2-5)
 4a. Paul’s qualifications (7:6-7)

 2. Marriage…Paul’s gifting is not normative for others (7:7b-24)
 [See Talbert’s chiastic structure]

 B. Paul **advises** the unmarried in light of practical wisdom (7:25-40)

Paul is not laying a normative demand on the readers (7:35; cf. 7:6) but is advising them in light of his wisdom. As Talbert observes,

“In this tightly organized section, 7:25-40, the apostle has taken up the question of the unmarried raised by the Corinthians in their letter and has said that *theologically* there is no problem with marriage, although *practically* there are

arguments for remaining unmarried if one has ‘desire under control’ (v. 37).” [p. 51]

Stanley B. Marrow’s article (“Marriage and Divorce in the New Testament,” *ATR* 70, pp. 3-6) makes the distinct point that **Paul views celibacy as a gift, not a choice**.

**Other** observations about the flow of the text

* Garland sees the subjects divided by an introductory verb (e.g. I say, I command, I think). By these *markers* he outlines the chapter as:

 A. Sexual relations within marriage (7:1-5)
 B. Celibacy or marriage for the unmarried and widows (7:6-9)
 C. Divorce for those married to Christians and for those married to non-Christians (7:10-16)
 D. Principle underlying the discussion: “Remain as you are” (7:17-24)
 E. The advisability of marriage for the betrothed and for widows (7:25-40)

* Most treat 7:1-7 as a unit and maintain outlines close to the paragraphs represented in the NIV. While the paragraphs are still helpful, deeper structures like Talbert’s chiastic observations are crucial to surface.

 A. The affirmation of sex in marriage (7:1-7)
 B. The sanctity of marriage (7:8-16)
 1. The unmarried and widows should marry if they do not have the gift of celibacy (7:8-9)
 2. Marriage is permanent (7:10-16)
 1a. The dominical tradition (7:10-11)
 2a. The Pauline explanation (7:12-16)
 1b. Paul affirms the sanctity of marriage even in mixed partnerships (7:12-14)
 2b. Paul only allows an unbeliever to leave (7:15-16)
 C. The “remain as you are” principle from Paul (7:17-24)
 D. Paul’s advice to the unmarried (7:25-35)
 1. The “present crisis” flavors the prospects of marriage
 (7:25-31)
 1a. The “remain as you are” is a wisest course of
 action, but marriage is still permitted (7:25-28)
 2a. Paul’s eschatology flavors his view of life (7:29-31)
 2. Paul honestly reflects on “the real world” (7:32-35)
 E. The special issue of betrothed virgins (7:36-38)
 F. A statement for widows (7:39-40)

* Read Fee’s Commentary introduction to 1 Cor 7-16 for a helpful overview.
* Hays’ reflections on the big ideas of 1 Cor 7 are helpful.
* Victor Wimbush, *Paul, the Worldly Ascetic* (Waco: Mercer University Press) lays out the following as the marital status diversity:

 7:1-7 Married couples: the question of the purity of sex

 7:8-9 Singles who have not been married [some say widowers] and younger widows: the question of wisdom of marriage

 7:10-11 Married couples, both parties are believers: the question about divorce

 7:12-16 Married couples, one party a believer and the other is not: the question about divorce

 [7:17-24 Statement of general principles: “remain”]

 7:25-38 Engaged parties: the question about perennial and rigorous
 celibacy

[7:29-35 Suggested model of ascetic piety: “this is what I mean” with analogies and explication]

 7:39-40a Older widows: the question of remarriage

 7:40b Conclusion to older widows and the chapter

**3. An overview of the biblical texts on divorce (see handout at end of text treatment)**

**OUTLINED TREATMENT OF 1 COR 7** \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

A. Paul’s Response to Issues of Sex and Marriage (7:1-40)

 **1. Paul responds to issues of sex and marriage (7:1-24)**

 **1a. Marriage realities…normative and sexual not celibate (7:1-7)**

**1b. The introductory marker (7:1a)**

**2b. The question/slogan (7:1b): Assertion or quotation, affirmation or slogan?**

 1c. If it is an assertion…then it is Paul making the statement and explaining it.
 2c. If it is a slogan (whether framed as statement or
 question), then it is Paul quoting the Corinthians with his following response.

If 7:1 is framed as a question, what would the original question have been? Perhaps, “Is it not better for a person *not* to have sexual intercourse?” In some way, Paul probably tones down the original question, using “it is good” rather than terms like “better,” “necessary,” etc.

Translation *faux paus* … The **NIV/1984** translation of 7:1, “it is good for a man not to touch a woman,” as “it is good for a man not to marry,” misconstrues the entire context of 1 Cor 7. [Read **Gordon D. Fee, "1 Corinthians 7:1 in the NIV," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23 (December 1980):307-314.]** This poor translation judgment was changed in the NIV/2011 to “It is good for a man not to have sexual relations with a woman.”

**3b. Paul’s evaluation of the issue (7:2-5)**

Charles Talbert notes the **chiastic structure** of this part and Garland extends its description.

 A But because of fornications (7:2a)
 B Let each one have (not “get” but=sex) his own wife or her own husband (7:2b,c)
 C Let the husband fulfill his sexual obligations to his wife (7:3a)
 D and likewise the wife to her husband (7:3b)
 D’ The wife does not have authority over her own body but her husband (7:4a)
 C’ and likewise the husband does not have authority over his own body but his wife (7:4b)
 B’ Do not deprive one another (7:5a,b)
 A’ because of your lack of self-control [avoid immorality] (7:5c)

Sex in marriage is a valid activity for human need (7:2). Paul’s command “to have” one’s own wife or husband (7:2) is a euphemism for sex and assumes marriage.

Marriage, by its very nature, promotes human inter-dependence (7:3-6). Paul strongly condemns sexual abstention by marriage partners. Paul’s use of “ought” (ὀφειλὴν) in 7:3 may be polemical. The state of marriage gives each partner certain conjugal rights to which the other partner must acquiesce. If abstinence is practiced, it must be by mutual consent. Sex is normative. Sex in marriage is a deontological principle.

Paul’s command not to “deprive” (7:5) one another of sexual release is a present imperative in a prohibition. *Some* view this as implying that the audience is to “stop” (cf. NASB) depriving one another (in contrast to an Aorist Subjunctive, “don’t start”). This view of Greek grammar is not a necessary assertion but must be sustained by the contextual implications. Whatever the case, Paul is speaking **against** a mindset of abstinence in the strongest terms.

Perhaps this context also speaks against the negative stereotype of the Bible that sex is for procreation and not pleasure. Some Christian communities, with an aberrant view of sexuality, have tried to promote this mindset.

**4b. Paul’s qualifications (7:6-7)**

The concession of 7:6 does not refer to Paul's teaching. The **larger interpretive question is what the demonstrative pronoun “this” (τοῦτο) in 7:6 refers to** (Winter, 233-40). The major views that emerge:

* The “concession” of **7:6 refers back** **to the marriage of 7:2**. If this is true, then Paul presents “marriage as a concession to the lack of self-control and a less desirable option for Christians” (Godet, Mare, Findlay; cf. Winter, 233).
* The “concession” of **7:6 refers back to the mutually agreed sexual abstinence of 7:5** (cf. Barrett, Bruce, Fee, Kistemaker). It would be a concession because sex in marriage is a norm.
* The “concession” of 7:6 **refers forward to 7:7** with 7:8-16 (Winter’s view, 234-40). That is, Paul’s pragmatic recognition of being un-married is his choice but is in no way prescriptive to anyone else. Winter argues that when the neuter pronoun is used with a verb of saying followed by an actual or implied “that” (ὅτι but not ἵνα) the pronoun has a forward looking reference (i.e. upcoming context). Compare Rom 6:6; 1 Cor 7:26; Gal 3:17; Eph 4:17).

Most **paragraph Bibles** have 7:1-7 as a unit. The ESV breaks out 7:6-7 as a separate paragraph, thus leaving open the issue of which direction to read 7:6 (although this may e the translators why of only reading it with 7:7). It is amazing how much “meaning” hangs on deciding the reference of a simple pronoun!

**Because of the pattern of Genesis and other household passages, it would be odd for Paul to promote a view of humanness that would contradict the primacy of marriage.** Paul functionally recognizes the advantage of singleness, but he never promotes it as a norm. **7:7 conditions the milieu of 7:8-24**. Read the terminal verses, 7 and 24. Compare also his instruction about the qualifications for a ministry leader in the Pastoral Epistles.

Discuss the meaning of “gift” (χάρισμα not δῶρον) in 7:7.

* First, Paul’s gift language gives us another item for our “list.” Since gifts are usually special endowments, marriage is probably not a gift but a norm.
* Garland notes that since **celibacy is a special gift**, it therefore includes **three implications** (271-272): (1) it is not an issue of personal preference or choice or a meritorious feat of self-control but a ‘gift’ from God; (2) as a gift, it is for special service in the church; (3) this gift renders one non-driven for natural sexual desire and is therefore ‘unusal.’

Note how **Paul** discusses this issue. He ***does not exhort individuals to “find” God’s will about the matter of marriage or celibacy.* It is a norm or a “gift” for some not to marry.** And the gift (freedom from sexual need) is not sought but is a special endowment. God’s sovereign will is discerned in the normal course of life. So there are no allusions about a subjective process to decide whether you are going to live with “burning with passion” because of some assumed calling. “If you burn, you ain’t called to celibacy.”

Think about how “FALL Theology” factors into the problem of decisions about marriage. For example, **sometimes we make decisions about life and sometimes life makes decisions for us**.

 **2a. Marriage…Paul’s gifting is not normative for others (7:7b-24)**

Talbert’s analysis suggests another chiastic structure for 7:7b-24:

 A Each has his or her own special gift from God and so lives (7:7b)
 B I say to the unmarried and widows (7:8-9)
 C the Lord says to the married (7:10-11)
 B I say to those married to unbelievers (7:12-16)
 A Live in terms of the gifts assigned to you and inn terms of your
 Christian calling (7:17-24)

One could conform their outline to the above, for the moment the following is more of a paragraph approach.

**1b. The sanctity of marriage (7:7b, 8-16)**

 1c. The unmarried and widows should marry if they do not have the gift of celibacy (7:7b, 8-9)

Paul’s theme of “remain as you are” emerges throughout 7:8-16. **Paul’s use of “good” is not moral good but functional convenience** (back to 7:6-7 as setting this context… “concession” not command).

Paul addresses the τοῖς ἀγάμοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις, which is usually translated, “to the unmarried and widows.” The problem is that the first term translated “unmarried” can have a very broad range of meaning and is very contextually dependent for its meaning.

* The term for “unmarried” only occurs in this chapter in the NT and its meaning varies: 7:8; 7:11 (divorced woman); 7:32 (single man); 7:34 (single virgin woman).
* “unmarried” may cover everyone in that category (widowed, divorced, never married). Witherington translates this “to the unmarried and especially the widows,” thus focusing its meaning.
* A number of prominent commentators have noted that this term can mean “widowers” (the male counterpart to widows). Such an approach is logically attractive and provides “balance of pairs” in the overall context of 1 Cor 7 and its various categories (see Garland, Note 7:8, p. 275-76; Fee; Thiselton?). It also avoids the unlikely attitude of Paul to lump all categories of single, single-again, widowers, etc. into one non-descript group.
* Fitzmyer notes that Eusebius approvingly quotes Clement of Alexandria’s use of Phil. 4:3 to apply to Paul’s wife (Origen also in his Romans 1:1 commentary). This is historically interesting, but a stretch for the Greek construction of “genuine yoke…” (cf. 1 Tim 1:2; Titus 1:4 for “genuine”; the term translated “yoke…” is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT, that means “only used once”).

When Paul says, “as I am” in 7:8, is he putting himself under the ἀγάμοις category? Paul was a Jewish elder and the expected norm for elders was to marry. It is unlikely that Paul was never married, although it seems clear that he is presently “unmarried.” But what was his status? A widower? One whose wife abandoned him? We just don’t know (cf. Garland’s note 276-77).

7:9 makes it clear that widowers and widows who do not “have the gift” should remarry. The use of “burn” in 7:9b most naturally in this context refers to “burn with sexual passion,” not “burn in gehenna” (a rabbinic idea, *Pirqe bot* i.5). One only needs to observe the tragic history of many “celibate priests” to see the damage that denying a legitimate outlet for one’s passion can cause. This also supports celibacy as a gift not a choice.

On 7:9, see J. Edward Ellis, “Controlled Burn: The Romantic Note in 1 Corinthians 7.” (*Journal of the NABPR*):89-98. He notes that Talbert, Fee, Witherington and Furnish all agree that “Paul does not in 1 Corinthians express a desire, or even a fond wish, that all Christians be celibate.” (p. 91).

 2c. Marriage is permanent (7:10-16)

 1d. The dominical tradition (7:10-11)

In 7:10-11, Paul addresses the wives first. This reverses his pattern from 7:2-3, 4, 12-13, 14-15, 27-28, 32-34. This may imply an issue in Corinth.

“Dominical” is the Latin way to refer to the teaching of Jesus. Paul begins his address to married couples by calling forth Jesus’s teaching from the Gospels. Paul uses the “purest” of the Gospel traditions, the Matthean exception clause is not present. The absense of the exception clause may support one of the “specialized” views of the clause rather than a general exception. It seems that if Paul would have understood sexual immorality as a general grounds for divorce, 1 Cor 7 would have been the place to use it.

 2d. The Pauline explanation (7:12-16)

 1e. Paul affirms the sanctity of marriage even in mixed-belief partnerships (7:12-14)

Paul’s use of “I, not the Lord” does not undermine his authority but merely sets his statements in contrast to dominical tradition.

7:12-13 clearly teaches that the marriage bond is not trumped for spiritual reasons. Although saved and unsaved partners reflect the greatest of spiritual incompatibility, there is still not a reason for divorce. “Unequal yoke” marriages can not be dissolved for so-called spiritual reasons. Think of it this way: If conversion finds one in an unequal yoke marriage, then that is God’s will for you.

What is the code of holiness in 7:14? It is interesting that Paul has reversed the metaphor of defilement. In 5:6 bad leaven ruins the whole loaf and in 6:15-17, to be with a prostitute defiles. Its focus is environmental not forensic. The OT had a tradition of “holiness by association” (cf. Exod 29:37; Lev 6:18; Rom 11:16; cf. Bruce and Thiselton) which may be reflected here. Leon Morris notes,

“It is not possible here to give precise definition of what this signifies. But it is a scriptural principle that the blessings arising from fellowship with God are not confined to the immediate recipients, but extend to others (e.g. Gen 15:18; 17:7; 18:26ff; 1 Kings 15:4; Isa 37:4).” (p. 110)

While it is a privilege to be in an environment of holiness for one’s own good and possible salvation, it is not a substitute for personal belief. All in all, marriage really is a sacred institution. Paul’s “halakic” type argument is focused on the legitimization of the mixed marriage and not on the forensic issues of salvation. The phrase “is sanctified” is basically “is eligible,” meaning the mixed marriage must be maintained if at all possible. See the extensive article by Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, “Jewish Laws on Illicit Marriage, the Defilement of Offspring, and the Holiness of the Temple: A New Halakic Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7:14” (*JBL* 121 [2002]:711-744).

In light of all this, how will you approach counseling married couples where one is a believer and one is not? How will your support of the marriage affect the unbelieving (probably church hating) partner?

Furthermore, this context is not to be used to cover issues such as spousal abuse. This is not the subject here. There is no “direct level” text for such abuse. So how would you deal with it?

 2e. Paul only allows an unbeliever to leave (7:15-16)

7:15 recognizes the fact that a believing partner cannot force a spouse to maintain the marriage, no matter how one may wish to do so. Paul recognizes this fact and releases the believer from the pressure of being victimized by an unbeliever leaving the relationship. There are several key peaces to this text.

First, consider the translations:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| εἰ δὲ ὁ ἄπιστος χωρίζεται, χωριζέσθω· οὐ δεδούλωται ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἡ ἀδελφὴ ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις· ἐν δὲ εἰρήνῃ κέκληκεν ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός.Literal: But if the unbeliever **separates [=divorce]**, let him/her seperate. The brother or the sister in such cases is not **bound**. But in peace God has called you. | NASB: Yet if the unbelieving one **leaves**, let him leave; the brother or the sister is not **under bondage** in such *cases*, but God has called us to peace. | ESV: But if the unbelieving partner **separates**, let it be so. In such cases the brother or sister is not **enslaved**. God has called you to peace. | NIV: But if the unbeliever **leave**s, let him do so. A believing man or woman is not **bound** in such circumstances; God has called us to live in peace. |

The Greek word for “separate” or “leave” was a common Greek term in papyri marriage contracts for divorce (cf. BDAG). So it is normal vocabulary for this event.

There are three striking items:

* The leaving is put in the imperative mood, “let him/her separate.” If the unbeliever chooses to go, there is no halting of opinion about the issue (although redemptive processes to save the marriage are assumed in context)
* Brother and sister are specific labels.
* “not bound” should be understood in the context of this specific text, therefore, “not bound” means (1) you do not have to feel guilty that you could not redeem the marriage and make them stay, and (2) the closing statement

of “peace” indicates that you should not feel “bound” to fight in a manner that goes beyond reasonable effort. It is unlikely that this statement has remarriage in view.

**2b. The “remain as you are” principle from Paul (7:17-24)**

Paul emphasizes “remain as you are” throughout the unit (7:17, 20, 24). It is presented, however, as a principle not as a law. We might call this the “principle of providence.” Unfortunately in life, there is not only positive providence but negative providence as well.

In 7:17-24, Paul uses an ABA’ chiastic structure:

 A (7:17-19)
 B (7:20-23)
 A’ (7:24)

 1b. 7:17-19

 1b. Remain as you are (7:17)
 2b. Circumcision as an illustration (7:18-19)

 2b. 7:20-23

 1b. Remain as you are (7:20)
 2b. Slavery as an illustration (7:21-23)

 3b. 7:24 Remain as you are

 **B. Paul advises the unmarried in light of practical wisdom (7:25-40)**

Note how 7:25 balances with 7:40 to present this section as Paul’s wisdom about life not God’s command to be obeyed (cf. 7:6).

 **1. Paul’s advice to the unmarried (7:25-35)**

**1a. For the “betrothed” (engaged? Greek = “virgins”), the “present crisis” flavors the prospects of marriage (7:25-31)**

 1b. The “remain as you are” is a wisest course of
 action, but marriage is still permitted (7:25-28)

The audience for this section are the “virgins” (παρθένος). The NIV provides the literal rendering, “virgins” and the ESV provides the interpretive translation “betrothed.” The meaning of virgins in 7:25 is highly disputed, although 7:36-38 is clearly a betrothed issue. So there could be a broader category in 7:25 that differs with 7:36-38. There are at least four proposals to explain “virgins”:

* Father / daughter
* Man / women in a “spiritual marriage” withholding sex
* Levirate marriage scenario
* Engaged/Betrothed couple

However, Garland observes,

“The most plausible option is that “the virgins” comprise betrothed women (cf. Matt. 1:18, 23; Luke 1:27; cf. 2 Cor. 11:2) [see footnote 4 for other views]. Presumably, those who are engaged have misgivings about whether to go through with their marriage.” (320)

What is the identity of the “present distress”?

* A local famine (Winter)
* Some localized persecution of the community (TDNT)
* The eschaton is about to dawn (Barrett; Conzelmann; Garland)

Dealing with localized challenges is part and parcel of being Christian. It would not call for the extreme measures that Paul is suggesting. 7:29-31 also give a strong eschaton flavor to this context. Question to consider…if Paul had our perspective on the temporal aspect of waiting for the eschaton, would he have given the same advice? He is giving “wise advice” in 1 Cor. 7, not binding commands. Would he have set aside the Genesis mandate of marriage as “lesser” without being consumed by an “any moment” eschaton?

Charles Talbert sees Paul raising and responding to four issues:

 Issue raised Response given

 7:26, the present distress 7:29-31, a description of the birth pangs
 is the first reason to “remain of the eschaton
 as you are”

 7:27, “remain as you are” 7:39-40, the widows
 applied

 7:28a, exceptions to the 7:36-38, passion
 general rule

 7:28b, the second reason to 7:32-35, further elaboration of marital stress
 “remain as you are” = honest while upholding its normality
 observations concerning marital
 stress

 2b. Paul’s eschatology flavors his view of life (7:29-31)

Cf. 2 Esdras 16:37-44; Mark 13:20; 1 Thess 4:15; 1 Cor. 15:51

**2a. Paul honestly reflects on “the real world” (7:32-35)**

Reflect out loud about (1) how marriage brings new values (which are biblically supported), and (2) how this squares with the normative created pattern of marriage and family.

 **2. The special issue of betrothed virgins (7:36-38)**

Who is the controlling person (“anyone,” “his”)? Is it the “father” of a virgin or the “financee” in a bethrothed situation or another construct?! Cf. the NIV on 7:36 with its note. Again, the ESV gives an interpretive translation without providing any footnote!

 KJV “if any man…toward his virgin…”
 NASB “if any man…toward his virgin daughter…”
 NRSV “if anyone…toward his fiancee…”
 ESV “if anyone…toward his betrothed…”
 NEB “if a man has a partner in celibacy…towards her…”
 NIV “if anyone…toward the virgin he is engaged to…” [text]
 NIV “if anyone…his daughter…” [footnote]
 NLT “if any man…his fiancee…”

You can only imagine the literature base behind the meaning of this verse! Cf. Garland 336ff. for how the interpretations are validated.

7:36 has two conditional clauses, “if” (first class) and “if” (third class).

7:38, “better” ? (κρεῖσσον) The range of meaning for the Greek adjective includes (1) higher in rank, preferable, better (Heb 1:4, superior to angels; 1 Cor 12:31a in relation to gifts); (2) as an adjective, more useful, more advantageous, better (Heb. 6:9; 1 Cor. 11:17; 7:9; or as an adverb, 1 Cor 7:38; Heb 12:24) (BDAG in.loc.). This term is not comparative on a moral basis, but on a functional continnum.

Fee observes that singleness is “better” “…not because one situation is inherently ‘better’ than the other. That is precisely what he [Paul] has argued against throughout. Therefore, one must go back to v. 26 for what makes it better; it is ‘because of the present distress’. (Fee, 354).

 **3. A statement for widows (7:39-40)**

At the end of the day, “to remain single is to be happier, as Paul sees it; but not to remain single is not to lose any status with God” (Wimbush, 20). So it is an issue of “happier” (because of the present distress), not “holier.” This is an area some in Corinth didn’t understand and, therefore, Paul had to correct their wrong views of sex and marriage.

 **\* \* \* \* \* \* Excursus on Marriage and Divorce in the Bible \* \* \* \***

**MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE IN THE BIBLE**

**Gary T. Meadors**

A. Developing a Biblical Theology of Marriage and Sexual Relations

 1. Marriage is viewed as kinship in the Bible and is treated as such in later legal codes (Gen 1:26-27; 2:24). The phrase, “two become one” is a metaphor for kinship.

 2. Marriage is presented as an answer to created needs for relationship (Gen 2:20-25).

 3. Marriage relates to the cultural mandate of Genesis (Gen 1:26-31).

 4. The sanctity of sexual relations is thoroughly imaged throughout Scripture (Gen 1-3;Gen 6; Ex 20; The Decalogue; Lev 18; Proverbs;1 Cor 7:16). While sanctioned sex achieves procreation, it would be ludicrous to claim that that is all it achieves (See Fitzmyer’s discussion in location. Remember, he writes as a Catholic scholar).

 5. The self-satisfaction of sexual drives (often the hidden agenda under the umbrella of relational loneliness) is not the primary criterion for decision-making, as our current culture often demands. At the same time, sexual desire is a created category.

 6. Marriage provides a major relational imagery that is utilized throughout Scripture.

B. A Review of Passages Which Pertain to a Biblical Theology of Divorce (large inclusive overview)

 1. Genesis 2:24

 2. Exodus 21

 3. Leviticus 18 Unlawful sexual relation list

 4. Deuteronomy 24:1-4
1a. This passage is actually focused on case law for remarriage. "The verses do not legislate divorce, but treat it as a practice already known" but no where delineated within canonical literature! (Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, NICOT, 304-05).

 2a. There have been at least five proposals concerning how to understand Deut 24 (cf. H&W, 106-110).
1b. To prohibit hasty divorce (Murray, Atkinson)
2b. Prohibits an especially serious level of adultery (Craigie)
3b. Prohibit multiple sexual relationships of a wife thus creating legal defilement (Isaksson, Derrett)
4b. To prohibit the temptation to reject the second marriage and return to the first and commit a form of incest (Yaron)
5b. To protect the first marriage from becoming incest (Wenham).

The bond of marriage ("one flesh") is not dissolved by entering into a second marriage. The first

wife is counted as a "close relative" and that relationship is indissoluable. To remarry here (the

actual prohibition of Deut 24), even if the second husband is dead (which is usually a fact which

causes dissolution), is like marrying your sister and is thus viewed as incest.

 5. Ezra 9, 10 Israel and inter-marriage = a historical particularity

 6. Malachi 2:10-16 Images of Israel as an unfaithful wife (*rib* pattern); 2:16 “I hate divorce”

 7. Mark 10:1-12

 8. Luke 16:18

 9. Matthew’s so-called exception clause, “except for porneia”

 1a. Matt 5:31-32

 2a. Matt 19:5-9

 3a. Jesus’ comment about Moses and Deuteronomy 24

 Genesis 2:24 Deuteronomy 24 Matthew/Jesus

 Institution of Cultural Concession 5:31-32…ideal Marriage…ideal

 10. Romans 7:1-3 Death of a spouse

 11. 1 Cor 7:10-11

 12. 1 Cor 7:15

 13. Also, statements for special categories that provide indirect information (1 Cor 7:39-40; 1 Tim 3:2, 12; Tit 1:6; 1 Tim 5:9)

D. An Overview of the History of Interpretation (cf. **Heth and Wenham**, upon which this section draws heavily)

 1. Introduction

 The following overview endeavors to expose the student to how a variety of interpreters have organized the above noted data into theological positions.

 The focus of this analysis will also be upon the major crux interpretum, Matthew's "exception clause".

 2. Major Positions

 1a. **The Early Church View** (Heth and Wenham)

 1b. Definition (cf. H&W, 22, 50)

"The marriage bond was seen to unite both parties until the death of one of them. When a marriage partner was guilty of unchastity, usually understood to mean adultery, the other was expected to separate but did not have the right to remarry" (H&W, 22). This is also claimed to be the case with desertion in 1 Cor 7:15.

This view usually understands πoρvεία as unchastity in violation to a marriage union.

Therefore, there is a grounds for divorce but **no remarriage**.

 2b. Elaboration

 1c. The evidence in the early Fathers

 1d. Hermas

 The Shepherd of Hermas, "Mandates", 4.1

 2d. Justin Martyr (in Rome about A.D. 130-165, where he was marytred)

 First Apology, chs. 15-17

 Second Apology, 2.1-7

 3d. Athenagoras (ca. 177)

 Supplication for the Christians

 4d. Theophilus of Antioch (ca. 180; first extant source to cite the Matthean "exception")

 5d. Irenaeus (Born ca. 140-160; worked in Smyrna)

 Against Heresies, 4.15.2 (cf. 185)

 6d. Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150-215

 Stromata, 2.23.145.3ff.

 7d. Origin (ca. 185-254; a pupil of Clement)

 cf. Commentary on Matthew, in ANF, in.loc.

 8d. Tertullian (ca. 155-220, Carthage, North Africa)

 2c. Views on key biblical texts

 2a. **The Erasmian View** (John Murray)

 1b. Definition

 Sexual infidelity (Mt 5 & 19) and desertion of a spouse (1 Cor 7:15) provide grounds for divorce and the right to remarry is implied.

 2b. Elaboration

 1c. Historical overview

 1d. The Early Church View held sway until the 16th century.

 One exception is Ambrosiaster (ca. writing date 366-383; cf. H&W, 38), a sort of pre-Erasmian.

 2d. Erasmus (1466-1536)

 Erasmus was an enlightened humanist and Christian pragmatist (who also was known to dislike the Roman Catholic authoritarianism!). **He sought to synthesize Canon Law with the principles of Enlightenment** (cf. his Annotations on 1 Cor 7 [1519], where he viewed the prevailing view of no divorce or remarriage as cruel, and on that basis set out to revise it). Out of this he laid down two new "interpretive" principles for severe marriage problems.

 "[1] It should be permissible to dissolve certain marriages, not fortuitously but for very serious reasons, by the ecclesiastical authorities or recognized judges, and [2] to give the innocent party the freedom to marry again" (H&W, 76, dependent on Olsen).

 In short, he viewed charity as more important than canon law and endeavored to argue such from God's gracious treatment of mankind in other domains.

 J. B. Payne (Erasmus, 124) observed, "[he] reveals himself not only as a historical, but also as something of an ethical, relativist and contextualist who thinks that love, which is the substance of the law of nature and the law of Scripture, is the only ultimate guide to human behavior--not human, historically conditioned laws."

 3d. The Protestant Reformers perpetuated Erasmus' exegesis of the divorce texts.

 1e. The historical situation

 It is important to view this period in its own sitz im leben. The struggle with the Roman Catholic Church conditioned the views of Erasmus (who stayed in the Church as a naughty son) and Luther (who departed).

 At the Council of Trent (11/11/1563) the Reformers views, which reflected Erasmus of 50 years prior, were condemned.

 2e. Luther adopted immorality/dessertion as grounds and allowed remarriage.

 3e. Calvin

 4e. The Westminster Confession

 John Milton (1608-1674) published his The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce (July 1643) one month after the Westminster Assembly convened. His statements were for radical reform away from strict views. As Erasmus sought to synthesize Romanism with the Enlightenment, **Milton sought to synthesize the Reformation with Humanism**. The Assembly, however, stayed with the Calvin/Beza theology.

 See insert in Appendices.

 4d. Modern development of the Erasmian position (H&W, ch. 4)

 H&W discuss three major modern variations:

 1e. Adultery/Desertion are grounds for divorce and therefore, remarriage (John Murray)

 2e. πoρvεία intends a wide range of sins, so grounds can be broadened (David Atkinson)

 3e. Matthean redaction introduced the exception clauses which were not original with Jesus, thus showing a pragmatic development within the Church (Allen, Matthew, old ICC)

 2c. Other issues on texts (for summary see H&W, 83ff.)

A key issue with the Erasmian tradition is the justification for the "innocent" party to remarry.

"There are two pillars which support the superstructure of the Erasmian view today. The **first** is the belief that the divorce which Jesus spoke about was the Mosaic dissolution divorce [i.e. Dt 24], and the **second** is the understanding that the exception clause qualifies the entire protasis of Matthew 19:9 (= `Whoever divorces his wife...and marries another'), thus permitting both divorce and remarriage of the innocent party in the case of unchastity. This second argument appears to replace the exegetical basis for remarriage which the Reformers found in the legal fiction that the adulterer should be considered as dead" (H&W, 88).

 3a. **Unlawful Marriages View**

This category focuses on a specialized meaning of πoρvεία: sexual misconduct which is viewed as incest (or wrongful intermarriage). Two major views include:

 1b. The Rabbinic View (Baltensweiler, TZ 15 [1959]:340-356; Meier, 147-150; Fitzmyer; F.F. Bruce; Ryrie)

 "understands porneia in Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 to be the equivalent of Hebrew zenut, which in the context of the divorce sayings refers to illegitimate marriages within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and affinity found in Leviticus 18:6-18" (H&W, 154).

 Fitzmyer points out that zenut was used in the Qumran materials to refer to a number of specialized marital problems.

"...in this text [Damascus Document, CD 4:12b-5:14; cf. 11QTemple 57:17-19] we have a clear instance of marriage with degrees of kinship proscribed by Lv 18:13 being labeled as zenut. In the OT zenut is used both of harlotry (e.g., Jer 3:2, 9; Ez 23:27) and of idolatrous infidelity (Nm 14:33). In the LXX it is translated by porneia (e.g. Jer 3:2, 9). Whatever one might want to say about the nuances of the word zenut in the OT, it is clear that among the Jews who produced the Damascus Document the word had taken on further specific nuances, so that polygamy, divorce, and marriage within forbidden degrees of kinship could be referred to as zenut. Thus, in CD 4:20 and 5:8-11 we have "missing-link" evidence for a specific understanding of zenut as a term for marriage within forbidden degrees of kinship or for incestuous marriage; this is a specific understanding that is found among Palestinian Jews of the first century B.C. and A.D." ("The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence", 220-221).

 2b. The Intermarriage View

Here πoρvεία is viewed as referring to intermarriages between Jews and Gentiles, which are prohibited by law (cf. Deut 7:1-5; cf. Exod 34:16).

 Cf. Ezra 9, 10

 Cf. Jubilees 30:7, 10-11

Some view Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25 as a reference to OT law rather than immorality in
general.

 4a. **Betrothal View** (A. Isaksson, Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple [Gleerup, 1965])

This view also views πoρvεία as a specialized reference. It is argued that Matthew was

writing to a Jewish audience who was familar with the custom/law of divorce in the case of
a betrothed woman who was found to be sexually unfaithful and that πoρvεία would have been a term they would recognize in reference to it. The Betrothal period was viewed as marriage and the law treated it as such, but sexual consummation did not occur until after the actual marriage ceremony.

 Matt 1:18-25

The major problem is that the severe restriction on the term πoρvεία cannot be sustained.

 5a. **Preteritive View** (Augustine; Vawter; Fleming)

This view focuses on the unusual grammatical exception structures and the main issue of the context of Mt 19 (with grammar from 5:32), namely, "how does Deut 24 apply?" The exception is viewed as "an exception to the exception"! That is, a paraphrase would be "...anyone who divorces his wife, Deut 24 not withstanding, and...". Thus, Jesus rules out the classic exception to which the Pharisees were clinging. In essence, he is saying, there are no exceptions, period.

**Read** Vawter's article in the appendices. Vawter later switches to the unlawful marriage

View following Fitzmyer.

 6a. **Traditio-Historical Criticial View** (Catchpole; Allen)

This view represents an application of historical-critical methodologies, often driven by assumptions unacceptable to our understanding of the writers and the nature of Scripture.

 7a. **Broken Vows and Biblical-Historical Solutions** (Instone-Brewer)

Instone-Brewer is the most recent and most productive writer on the biblical and historical issues relating to divorce and remarriage (see bibliography). Instone-Brewer is a scholar of rabbinical material at the Tyndale house, Cambridge University. His basic approach is to note where the NT continues OT traditions (e.g. 1 Cor 7 with Exod 21) as grounds for divorce or remarriage. Exod 21 presents case law regulations for Jewish life. Should these be turned into apodictic law?

The present instructor is currently working through Instone-Brewer’s material and will withhold analysis until that research is completed.

 8a. Summary evaluation of views

 1a. The Erasmian view is the most widely held view at a popular church level, yet, it is the most indefensible view when historical and exegetical scrutiny is applied.

 2a. All of the other views, except the Early Church View, consider the exception to be applied to some special historical or grammatical understanding and not open to the general Erasmian "grounds for divorce and remarriage" approach. In fact, they all view remarriage as prohibited by Jesus' statements.

 9a. The Meadors’ View: On this issue, the Bible teaches the
“ideal” and assumes we will deal with specific cases of “less than
ideal” when they arise according to biblical teaching about sin,
repentance, forgiveness and restoration (albeit with consequences).

E. The Issue of Remarriage (see esp. Andrew Cornes; Mark Strauss, editor, *Remarriage After Divorce in Today’s Church: 3 Views*. Zondervan, 2006.)

 1. Gen 1:27; 2:18-25, esp. vs. 24--"cleave"; "one flesh"

What is the bond of marriage? The tracing out of the significance of "one flesh" indicates
that the OT viewed **marriage as an act that caused two people to become "related."** This is noted in how **kinship** laws (Lev 20:11-12, 14, 17, 19-21; Deut 22:30; 27:20, 22-23) are applied to married people. As the principle of blood relations creates a bond which by definition cannot be broken, so also marriage creates an indissoluable bond which is only dissolved by death.

 2. The issue of "dissoluability"

 The only way to circumvent the clear statements of Jesus that remarriage after divorce is adultery, is to argue that divorce dissolves the marriage bond. The Reformers used the principle of **"legal fiction"** (a sexually unfaithful partner is viewed as legally dead) and Murray assumes that valid divorce is dissolution. A number of other explanations exist among Erasmian interpreters since they all recognize the need to address this issue.

 3. Is remarriage addressed by the key texts?

 The placement of the exception phrase in Mt 19:9, when studied in light of normal grammatical patterns in Matthew and the NT, argues that it applies to "put away" which preceeds it and not to "marry" (i.e. remarry) which follows (H&W, 113-120). This reading corrrelates with Mark and Luke, namely,

 remarriage is always viewed as adultery. This opinion is a “forensic” necessity that does not necessarily imply “perpetual adultery.”

F. Application Philosophy Built on Biblical Data

 1. The eternal cultural problem is whether we will accept God's view of life or whether we will endeavor to impose our own.

 Archer quote...(H&W, 95-96)

 2. So what is our pastoral approach in post facto situations?

 1a. We need to proceed on the basis of a holistic biblical philosophy.

 1b. How has God dealt with a sinful society?

 1c. Insights from Deut 24?

 2c. Implications of 1 Cor 6:11 in context

 3c. Paul's Gentile mission and the world he engaged.

 4c. Is there inspired development within the NT text? If so, what implications does that have for us?

 2b. How do you answer those who ask: "Is my remarriage valid?"

 1c. Do you understand the biblical view of marriage and divorce?

 2c. Have you responded to that understanding?

 3c. "remain as you are" if possible (assuming certain moral stipulations)

 1 Cor 7:17-24

 3b. How do we account for the human desires God created in us?

 1c. The desire for relationships--"it is not good for man to be alone"

 2c. Sexual desire is a created category.

 2a. Engage a biblical world view and rebuild your relationship with God, increase your understanding of His Word and proceed slowly with careful critical reflection about new relationships.
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 1 Corinthians 8

Gary T. Meadors

IV. Paul’s Response to a Written communiqué from Corinth (7:1-16:4; cf. 7:1)

 A. Paul’s response to issues of sex and marriage (7:1-40)

 **B. Paul's response to the question of food sacrificed to idols (8:1-11:1)**

**Section Summary:**

In 1 Cor 1-4, Paul addresses the authority of his message about the cross;

In 1 Cor 5-6, Paul addresses issues of sexual immorality;

In 1 Cor 7, Paul begins his response to Corinthian questions, namely marriage and sexuality;

Now in 1 Cor 8:1-11:1, Paul addresses the issue of idolatry in the empire context and the daily life of the Christian.

A worldview of idols permeated the world of Paul’s day. The integration of a plethora of deities and temples into daily life was like the air one breaths. Texts like Acts 15, 17, Romans 14:1-15:13; 1 Corinthians 8-10; 1 Thessalonians 1:9 reflect this atmosphere and the fact that this was a major issue for the early Christians.

Note the Περὶ δὲ pattern (8:1)

Compare 8:1 and 10:14 for terminal posts

Note 6:12 in reference to 10:23

Note conclusion stated in 10:31-11:1

These balanced texts provide continuity for the unit.

Possible chiasm: A Question of food offered to idols (8:1-13)
 B Waiving rights for the Gospel’s sake…ethics (9:1-23)
 A’ Question of food offered to idols (9:24-11:1)

 **1. The issue of ‘food sacrificed to idols’ (8:1-13)**

Three opportunities for this problem were present:

* Dining at the local temple (1 Cor 8:7-13; 10:1-22) [note fig. in Murphy-O’Connor’s *St. Paul's Corinth*, p. 163.]

Because the civil and social life of first century persons was so integrated with their idolatrous culture, the local temple was like a community center where many social events would occur. Besides family events like weddings and birthdays, there were trade guilds (Acts 19:24-25) and even funeral rites that were tied to using the temple as a social center.

The difficult issue of religious vs. social event is often noted (as if such distinction could

exist in the first century Roman world). Murphy-O’Connor noted the Temple “dinning rooms” for social events and Winter notes the issue of the “imperial cult” events. The imperial cult events would also delineate social status (high attended; low marginalized).

* Buying meat in the market (1 Cor 10:23-27)
* Dining at an unbelieving "friend's" home (1 Cor 10:28-31)

 1a. Reconstructing the context

**There are TWO major views on reconstructing the historical context of 1 Corinthians 8-10.** One must ***decide which set of lenses to apply to reading this context***. Once you have your glasses on, you see the material in the focus of your lenses.

**THE TRADITIONAL Academic VIEW** (Weiss; VonSoden; Murphy-O’Connor; Horsley; Willis; Conzelmann; Winter? p. 280; et.al.)

See Willis, Wendell Lee. *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985. Also cf. full-text article: Wendell, Willis. “1 Corinthians 8-10: A Retrospective After Twenty-Five Years.” *Restoration Quarterly*

This view represents the “strong” and “weak” as two groups who viewed the issue of idol meat differently and were in a struggle over their views.

Strong and weak are delineated by “worldview.” The strong had correct knowledge and therefore freedom whereas the weak were lacking knowledge and were therefore bound in conscience by inaccurate views about deities and their integration into society via food and social contact. **More important contextually, is Paul protecting the strong from the weak or the weak from the strong?! (cf. Thiselton, 611).** If the problem is encased in social status, it may be the latter. Some have even suggested that the “weak” were tempted to eat community cultic meals since they provided “meat” which they rarely had access to.

Assumptions (see Garland):

* the weak, bound by their past understandings and association with idols could not engage a new worldview and free themselves to eat with a clear conscience;
* Paul agreed with the strong as technically correct, but promoted the strong as responsible not to destroy the weak with the knowledge and freedom they exercised;
* “Paul made a distinction between innocuously consuming food associated with an idol (8:1-13) and participating in actual worship of an idol (10:14-22). Paul permitted idol food as long as no one was caused to stumble.” (Garland, 352)
* Paul’s maturity and ability to ignore ‘guilt by association’ was beyond the ability of the early church to grasp and practice.

This view (with many variations internal to it) would say:

* Paul rejects any eating that implies identification with idols, especially in-Temple events (10:1-22).
* Some, however, recognize that the Temples were also “community centers” and had “dinning halls” which might be rented for events. These interpreters would not see meat in the Temple in this context as a problem as long as the event is non-idol related.
* But Paul allows eating the meat in non-idolatry-implied situations since idols are really nothing (10:23-30).

**AN ALTERNATE academic VIEW** (Hurd, Gooch, Garland) [Which, ironically, is the “traditional” surface reading view!! i.e. the texts are applied to “guilt by association” situations]

**“…Paul forbade Christians from any association with any food overtly connected to idolatry.” (Garland’s article, “The Dispute….”, 173).**

This view, stimulated by a more literary critical procedure that requires literary/rhetorical unity in chs. 8-10, explains the whole context by one presupposition: Paul never allowed any idol “guilt by association” situations. The “weak” are more of a hypothetical construct by Paul to set up the argument. This view argues that 1 Cor 8 and 10 are holding the same view and not a “OK here” (ch. 8, meat markets, homes) and “not here” (ch. 10, in Temple) approach.

The primary difference of this view is the reconstruction of the background question of idol meat and *whether there were two views in conflict at Corinth*. John Hurd Jr., *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (Mercer University Press, 1965), challenged the traditional construct and claimed that there was really one view in Corinth about idol meat and that they were objecting to Paul’s view (avoid anything to do with idols) rather than seeking his clarification. Hurd paraphrased the view as follows:

“We [the Corinthians] find nothing wrong with eating idol meat. After all, we all have knowledge. We know that an idol has no real existence. We know that there is no God but one. For those in Christ all things are lawful, and as far as food is concerned everyone knows that ‘food is meant for the stomach and the stomach for food’. We fail to see what is to be gained by the avoidance of idol meat. You know yourself that when you were with us you never questioned what you ate and drank. Moreover, what of the markets? Are we to be required to inquire as to the history of each piece of meat we buy? And what about our friends? Are we to decline their invitations to banquets because of possible contamination by idol meat?” (Hurd, 146)

Hurd’s thesis, then, is that “the Corinthians’ objections stem from a single point of view at Corinth opposed in some degree to Paul’s. There was no ‘weak’ or ‘scandalized’ second party” (147). **As Garland summarizes Hurd, the Corinthians “were not asking, ‘Can we eat idol food?’ but**

**“Why can’t we eat idol food?’” (357).**

Tenants of the alternative view:

* a Western mindset of bifurcating one’s religious and social worlds has been read into 1 Cor 8-10. The mindset of the first century was not to compartmentalize the categories of life.
* any dining in a pagan temple would have carried with it an aroma of the idolatry of the institution.
* the conversation of 1 Cor 8-10 was not new. Paul and the Corinthians had discussed the issue and Paul’s view was not well received. Paul’s view is understood to be that no “food that was openly acknowledged to be offered to an idol” was permitted. This included temple dining, a meal at a friends, and the meat market. This is the worldview of a good Jew and “Paul had not become so ‘unjewed’ that he tolerated things that overtly reeked of idolatry” (Garland, 355).
* a major assumption of this view is that the Corinthians wanted to accommodate the social and political settings that were held in the natural atmosphere of the culture and its polytheism. Meals, in all cultures, are where the “deals” are made and social status is upheld (especially among the “elite”). To withdraw from this arena in religious protest would downgrade ones status and reputation in the world of power. As Garland powerfully puts it, “To shun gatherings that lubricated social and economic relations would make Christians conspicuous outcasts who held outlandish, antisocial, perverse religious beliefs” (Garland, 357). So the assumption is that the Corinthians’ were challenging Paul’s stand against “guilt by association” with idolatry.
* this view disputes that there are two groups, the “strong” and “weak.” It is claimed that we have read this into the text rather than out of it (sometimes reading Romans 14-15 into 1 Corinthians).

A WORKSHEET to compare the reading of 1 Corinthians 8 from these two perspectives:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| THE TRADITIONAL VIEW—two groups in conflict | THE ALTERNATIVE VIEW—a unified view from Paul, “NO,” with “weak” created for rhetorical purposes (?) |
| 8:1-38:4-68:7-88:9-13 | 8:1-38:4-68:7-88:9-13[What new perspective to 1 Cor 9:22; 10:13 does this view bring?] |

The **non-correlation** of 1 Corinthians 8-10 and Romans 14-15 (Garland, 358-362; cf. also Fee’s commentary):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 Corinthians 8-10 | Romans 14:1-15:13 |
| 1 Cor is about “idol meat.” | Romans is about Jewish food issues. |

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

 **1. The issue of ‘food sacrificed to idols’ (8:1-13)**

 1a. Reconstructing the context (material reviewed above)

Cf. also, David E. Garland, “The Dispute Over Food Sacrificed to Idols (1 Cor 8:1-11:1).” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 30 (2003):173-197.

 2a. Reading the context from these reconstructions !!

**1b. A traditional academic read outlined (still your prof’s view but held tentatively)**

The so-called “traditional view” has run so quickly to “freedom” that it often misses Paul’s clear emphasis on “no consort with idolatry.” This may be influenced by the legalistic nature of cultural fundamentalism.

* In 8:1-13, Paul warns against falling into any real participation with idolatry.
* In 9:24-10:22, Paul warns against arrogant knowledge flaunting participation.
* In 10:23-11:1, Paul warns against offending a brother by one’s own freedom.

 1c. The introduction of the issue (8:1-3)

 Two principles are introduced: knowledge and love.

 Knowledge =

 “Puffed up” (4:6, 18-19; 5:2; 8:1)

 Love =

 Cf. Acts 15:29/Jers. Council--Why is this decree not brought up as an issue here?

 2c. A biblical world-view is explicated (8:4-8)

 1d. A distorted metaphysic (vv. 4-6).

8:6 contains one of four explicit monotheistic texts in Paul (Rom 3:29-30; Gal 3:20; 1 Tim 2:5; cf. Acts 17).

 2d. A limited perceptual set (vv. 7-8).

 Think about how limited knowledge affects the accuracy of our
reflective life.

 3c. The application of the principle of liberty (vv. 9-13).

 1d. The "strong" are exhorted to bear the burden of responsibility (vv. 9, 13 -- terminal points).

 2d. The problems of failure in this area are delineated.

 1e. for the "weak" in conscience (vv. 10-11).

"conscience"--is a witness to the norms and values which we recognize and apply.

 cf. 10:25ff. See treatment of conscience later in notes.

"emboldened" …acting without a changed perceptual set.

This term actually means “edify” or “build up.” In 8:1, love “builds” up. Paul may be playing on the term since the “strong” claimed to strengthen the weak (cf. BAGD 558d).

"destroyed"

In what sense are they “destroyed”?

* Certainly not eternal loss (although Fee may leak some Arminianism here, cf. 387-88).
* Not physical death.
* Perhaps a destroyed process of discernment. Consider the
	+ repeated affirmation of “brother”;
	+ reference to a wounded conscience;
	+ the flow of the context;
	+ the use of this term in 1:19 suggests a reference to discernment not eternal salvation;
	+ and the double use of “stumble” in 8:13.

One’s process of discernment is destroyed when actions preceed re-education.

 2e. For the "strong" (v. 13).

 "sin against Christ" (= transgression of community)

 3d. Paul’s conclusion (8:13; cf. Rom 14:13-23)

**2b. An alternative view outline (Garland, 362)**

 1c. Introduction of the issue of idol food (8:1-6)

 2c. Refutation of their practice because of its danger to fellow Christians (8:7-13)

 3c. Paul’s own example to undergird his counsel (9:1-27)

 4c. Refutation of their practice from the negative example of the history of Israel
 in the wilderness (10:1-13)

 5c. Refutation of their practice from the example of the Lord’s Supper (10:14-22)

 6c. Practical advice for dealing with the issue of idol food in pagan settings
 (10:23-11:1)

B. Paul's response to the question of food sacrificed to idols (8:1-11:1)

 1. The issue of ‘food sacrificed to idols’ (8:1-13)

  **2. Apostolic rights, liberty and community ethics (9:1-27)**

Is Paul really arguing for “rights” to be set aside in 1 Cor 8 when he follows up with an argument for the exercise of apostolic rights in 1 Cor 9? Yet…his reflection is twofold: (1) rights are rights and, (2) only an informed setting aside is valid…not a setting aside for setting aside’s sake.

When one reads 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1, the question of “just how does 1 Cor. 9 fit between two chapters that are clearly dealing with the meat offered to idols issue?” The traditional view of Strong vs. Weak and the view that Paul had actually taught the Corinthians not to participate in any way with known idol meat, both explain the content of ch. 9 the same. The issue is how the content of ch. 9 fits the thesis of each view.

For the traditional view, Paul’s restriction of apostolic rights is a nice illustration of a strong person practicing self-sacrifice for the sake of the weak.

For the alternative view, Paul’s restriction is actually a continuation of his argument to restrict one’s rights. It fits even stronger with his original teaching not to participate.

Some argue that Paul is defending his apostleship against Corinthian rejection in 1 Cor. 9. This, however, is unlikely. Paul is actually counting on the Corinthian’s knowing what it means for him to be an apostle to make his argument of restricting one’s rights (cf. Garland, 396-401).

9:1 is crucial in the “apostolic” debate that will arise in chs. 12-14. See also 1 Cor 15 on “the last apostle.”

 1a. The delineation of rights (9:1-14).

 1b. An initial series of rhetorical questions (vv. 1-6).

 2b. A series of arguments for the full time vocational worker's right to receive support (from Boyer, p. 92;
 cf. 3 John).

 1c. Argument from human analogy (v. 7)

 2c. Argument from Scripture (vv. 8-10)
 Deut. 25:4

 3c. Argument from common sense (vv. 11-12)

 4c. Argument from actual practice (v. 13)

 5c. Argument from dominical tradition (v. 14)
 Cf. Luke 10:7; Matt 10:10

 2a. The voluntary declining of rights (9:15-18)

We are not rewarded for doing our duty but for ***how*** we go above and beyond the call of duty.

In academic terms, one does not get an A just because they fulfill the assignment. Doing your duty is at best a B. A’s are for going beyond the call of duty ;-)

 3a. The deliberate decision to serve all men (9:19-23)

 1b. The principle stated (9:19)

 (cf. v. 22b)

 2b. The principle applied (9:20-23)

 1c. Jews (9:20)

The "law" to which Paul refers is the Jewish law. Such law included the 613 written precepts of the Pentateuch and perhaps their oral amplification by the Jewish Elders. While Paul might observe the regulations of such law, he was quick to add that he did so voluntarily, not because he had any moral obligation to do so. Cf. Rom 6:14 - not under such law.

Paul's vow as an illustration (Acts 21:23ff.). While Paul did not see Jewish regulations and ceremony as binding upon the Christians, neither did he see them as taboo. They ranked as morally and religiously indifferent things (Bruce).

On the other hand, the moral law of God abides, especially as summarized in the law to love God and neighbor.

 2c. Gentiles (9:21)

Paul uses "law" here as in v. 20. He had no reason to observe the non-binding (normative) Jewish law while among those with whom such law was no issue.

The phrase "not free from God's law" is a general statement to confirm his obligation to God in the broader sense. No one is lawless.

"law of Christ" - perhaps reflected in 1 Cor. 11:1; Christ's example. Cf. Mk. 12:28ff.

 Lk. 10:25ff.; Rom. 8:4

 3c. Believers (9:22-23)

 1d. Paul's motive for self-control (9:22a) "win"

 2d. Paul's life principle (9:22b-23)

"all things to all men" - such a principle probably appeared inconsistent to Paul's critics. How could he talk about being free from the Mosaic law and yet turn around and observe it (vow in Acts 21)? Even today, some say Paul was backslidden in Acts 21 !!

The Christian worker who observes this Pauline principle *will* suffer.

 4a. The discipline of self-control (9:24-27)

The whole purpose of self-discipline is to accomplish a defined goal. *How* we play the game is important, but we should play to win.

 **3. Avoid Israel’s Failings (10:1-22)**

Section Summary: Evidently some of the Corinthians thought that salvation and identification with God's program provided an umbrella of protection from sin and judgment.

Is noteworthy that chapter 9 ends with a warning about the danger of being disqualified by failure to properly "run the race." Then chapter 10 paints a picture of how Israel was disqualified by (1) a wrong use of freedom and (2) by taking spiritual privileges for granted.

Review the “two views” about how to read 1 Cor 8-10 (cf. Garland).

 1a. Warnings by analogy with Israel's history (10:1-13)

Great spiritual privileges do not give one the liberty to violate moral precepts. Neither does such privilege ensure a proper response to God's stipulations.

 1b. Israel enjoyed a great place of privilege but it did not produce a proper response to God (10:1-5).

Paul’s analogy of "baptized into Moses" … Signifies the fact that Israel was placed under Moses’s leadership. They were identified with Israel’s greatest leader. Yet, they proved to be moral failures.

Perhaps Paul uses the metaphor of baptism to suggest subtly that one’s mere identification with Christian rites carries no more guarantee of blessing than did Israel’s association with Moses. *Divine blessing is based on individual and corporate obedience to God and not merely on association with his external program.*

"spiritual" food and drink … called such because the material elements signified spiritual realities (cf. *Didache* 10:3). Paul does not elaborate on their meaning.

"rock" … Because in the Pentateuchal narrative Moses fetches water from the rock of Meribah both at the beginning (Exod. 17.1-7) and towards the end (Num. 20.2-13) of the wilderness wanderings, Jewish legend (cf. PseudoPhilo, *Biblical* Antiquities x.7; Tosefta Sukkah iii.11f.) conceived the idea of a rock which travelled alongside the people throughout their forty years= journey and supplied them with water as they required it. Paul does not endorse this material fancy, but affirms that Christ accompanied his people as a spiritual source of refreshment throughout this period.” (Bruce, New Century Bible, 91)

 2b. Israel's actions are canonized object lessons for future generations (10:6-13).

 1c. Specific examples (10:6-10)

 1d. The nature of the examples (10:6)

Are they examples in retrospect or original intention (6a)? Bruce claims they are in retrospect (NCB, *in.loc.*), citing that tu/poi is not used as a technical term, but merely as “moral correspondence” (cf. 10:5, 7; Conzelmann, *in.loc.*; cont. Von Rad, *OTTheo*, 2.383f.).

The examples are pedagogical (6b), teaching that departure from God’s way brings destruction (cf. Num. 11:4-34).

 2d. The substance of the examples (10:7-
 10)

“Idolaters” (cf. Exod. 32:6)

Issue of “sexual immorality” (10:8) … a problem arises since Num 25:9 cites 24,000 as dying and Paul only notes 23,000.

How can you “test” God/Christ? Perhaps by imposing on his patience and testing his veracity/word.

“Grumbling” is not tolerated (cf. Num. 11:1 with Exod. 12:23 and Heb. 11:28). In Numbers 11:1 they are destroyed by “fire,” but here by the “Destroyer.” Paul may have viewed the “fire” as under the angel’s authority.

 2c. Resultant lesson (10:11-13)

1 Cor. 10:13 is a favorite memory verse for Christians. But what does it mean in context?

 2a. Warnings by analogy with Idol feasts and the Eucharist (10:14-22)

 1b. A proper explanation of the Eucharist (10:14-17)

 1c. The exhortation (10:14-15)

 2c. The explanation (10:16-22)

Paul uses 6 rhetorical questions to frame his call to flee idolatry: 10:16a, 16b; 10:18; 10:19; 10:22a; 10:22b.

 1d. The first series of questions (10:16- 17)

The usual order for communion is bread and cup (cf. Luke 22:17-19a; *Didache* 9.2ff.). Paul reverses the order to cup and bread here.

 2d. The second series of questions (10:18-22)

10:18 “guilt by association” represents levels of partnership: Israelite/Altar, Believer/Christ, Idol Feasts/Demons.

Paul’s statements in 1 Cor. 10 are viewed by the “traditional view” as different than ch. 8. Here the idols, while epistemologically nothing, are functionally something because clearly associated with idol feasts. The sole purpose of these feasts was to honor the patron gods. Feasts were clearly pagan in character and intent and therefore not acceptable to Christians.

 **4. Paul's summation of food offered to idols and the principle of
 liberty (10:23-11:1)**

Paul begins this concluding section with the same structure as 6:12, “All things are lawful, but….” (remember the “slogan” issue?).

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* EXCURSUS ON CONSCIENCE \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

 **CONSCIENCE--GUIDE, MONITOR, OR WHAT?**

How would you define conscience? We talk about this phenomenon constantly but when faced with explaining it we find ourselves in a quandary. In a recent column on "Dr. Dobson Answers Your Questions", Dobson struggled with how to explain this term. He begins by saying that "the subject of the conscience is an extremely complex and weighty topic. Philosophers and theologians have struggled with its meaning for centuries." [NOTE--Focus on the Family {January 1991} 5] He then makes some observations concerning its usage in psychological analysis, which was put forward with a sound intuition of the precariousness of an appeal to conscience. He closes, however, by noting that the NT cites the term on many occasions and that the Holy Spirit influences us through it. He pointed out that conscience is not our guide on one hand but asserts it may be used by God on the other. Which is it at any given moment? How do we delineate appropriate promptings of what we call conscience? How do we deal with people whose conscience gives no promptings at all?

The road to understanding the nature and function of conscience is to discern what role it plays in relation to the value system which we have identified as the product of a transformed mind. My thesis is that the value system is our guide as the only data base which can objectively be analyzed. **The conscience is a God given function of our self-awareness (self-consciousness) which witnesses to the dictates of our value system**. Conscience is not a lawgiver, it is a witness to the

laws which exist within the frame of reference by which we make judgments about ourselves and our world. Conscience is not some independent entity within our being. It is only one aspect of a human being's ability for self-aware critique. If we violate the values which we recognize and apply, then the pain we feel is what we call conscience (the term conscience is a word which is logically constructed to explain the inward pain of violation. It is a term of description not ontology). If we contemplate a course of action and we feel no pain, then we assume it is appropriate since our conscience does not alert us. This last scenario, however, is faulty. If the role of conscience is to monitor how we relate to our values, and the value system is not programmed in a certain area, we may not perceive the function of conscience since its function is bound within the realm of witnessing to our value judgments. It does not provide independent judgments, as if outside of ourselves, but it witnesses to the judgments which the value system has already delivered to our self-reflective capacity.

The above paragraph redundantly labors some key concepts which constitute the nature and function of conscience. Some terminology may be new to the reader since certain terms are essential in this discussion. Having given a summary statement of conscience, let us now consider the evidence which leads to the above analysis of conscience.

**I. AN OVERVIEW OF "CONSCIENCE"**

"Conscience" is a term we hear and use frequently, but for most people it is like an Almond
Joy candy bar--indescribably delicious!!

Brief history of usage in the Bible

 --No Hebrew term for conscience

 --Greek OT (LXX) only uses noun once (Ecc 10:20, the verb is in Job 27:6)

 --Concept in OT under *lev* and LXX καρδία (cf. 1 Jn 3:19-21)

 --Conscience comes from a verb "to know". Its oldest usage merely means to know,

 to be aware, to share knowledge (sometimes secretively, cf. Acts 5:2).

 --Chronologically, first use in NT = 1 Cor

 --NT pattern = Paul 27 (22 + 5 in Heb)

 Peter 3

 [a few more with verb [v], same pattern]

The following passages are placed in their chronological order. WHY??

 1 Cor 4:4[v]
 8:7
 8:10
 8:12
 10:25
 10:27

 10:28
 10:29
 2 Cor 1:12
 4:2
 5:11
 Rom 2:15
 9:1
 13:5
 Acts 5:2[v]
 12:12[v]
 14:6[v]
 23:1
 24:16
 1 Tim 1:5
 1:19
 3:9
 4:2
 2 Tim 1:3
 Titus 1:15
 1 Pet 2:19
 3:16
 3:21
 Heb 9:9
 9:14
 10:2
 10:22
 13:18

 Preliminary definition = **Conscience is a critical inner awareness, a witness in reference to the norms and values which we recognize and apply. It does not create norms and values but merely responds to our existing "software". Conscience must be educated/programmed in relation to a critically developed world and life view. This development for the Christian is rooted in special revelation, the Bible.**

**II. CONSIDER SEVERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF CONSCIENCE IN RELATION TO CHRISTIAN DECISION MAKING.**

 **A. CONSCIENCE IS A GOD GIVEN CAPACITY FOR SELF CRITIQUE.**

Conscience is an aspect of human kind's capacity for self reflection. It should not be

personified into an aspect independent of the person, e.g. the voice of God or of the Devil.
Self reflection is ourselves talking to ourselves and conscience interfaces with that inner discussion
to check if it is in line with recognized values.

 1 Cor 4:4--Verb form of συvείδησις is used. The absence of "conviction" does not in itself provide justification.

 Rom 2:14-15--An illustration (note its parenthetical connection) that the Gentiles self critique mechanism works better than the Jew's. The Jews resist the Law's role as convictor; the Gentiles "conscience" worked and should shame the Jew (cf. 2:13).

 1 Tim 4:2; Titus 1:15; Heb 9:14--critique gone sour

 Implications:

 **B. CONSCIENCE IS A WITNESS TO THE WORLD VIEW AND VALUE SYSTEM WHICH WE RECOGNIZE AND APPLY.**

Passages which describe conscience under the picture of a witness [a witness does not create
evidence but is bound to respond to the evidence which exists]

 Rom 2:15

 9:1

 2 Cor 1:12

 Cf. 2 Cor 4:2; 5:11--others called to witness

 Adjectival structures are a witness

 Clear (Acts 24:16; 1 Tim 3:9; 2 Tim 3:9; 2 Tim 1:3; 1 Pet 3:16; Heb 9:9;

 13:18)

 Good (1 Tim 1:5; 1:19; 1 Pet 3:21)

 1 Cor 8:7-13 note terms knowledge and conscience (cf. Rom 14:1ff "faith") A "weak" conscience is one which lacks knowledge upon which conviction can be built. If our world-view is faulty then our conscience is also [consider a continuum wrong to weak]. Transition of knowledge is always a period of weakness.

 Implications:

 **C. CONSCIENCE IS A MONITOR OF OUR THINKING IN RELATION TO DECISION MAKING. IT DOES NOT PROVIDE THE REASON FOR DECISIONS BUT RED AND GREEN LIGHTS IN RELATION TO DECISIONS.**

Conscience is not able to judge the right or wrong of your values, it merely monitors what
your grid recognizes as right or wrong. **Conscience is a servant of our value system.**

 1 Cor 8

 1 Cor 10:23-30

 Implications:

**CONCLUSIONS:**
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IV. Paul’s Response to a Written communiqué from Corinth (7:1-16:4; cf. 7:1)

 A. Paul’s response to issues of sex and marriage (7:1-40)
B. Paul's response to the question of food sacrificed to idols (8:1-11:1)
**C. Paul's Response to the questions of Public Worship (11:2-34)** 1. Male and Female in Worship before God (11:2-16)

Because there is no *peri de* introducing this section, some (Fitzmyer) wonder if the two issues in Chapter 11 were included in the 7:1 letter or whether Paul had wind of the issues and therefore treated them.

The sequence for treating this text is difficult since all issues need to be considered at the same time! Given the complexity of 1 Cor 11:2-16 in current Evangelical debate over gender, we will deal with this section in three movements:

A **basic reading of the text** as it stands with reflections on the text in relation to its gender issues

**Historical-cultural reconstruction** as a background to the text

Information for **further research on gender issues** in 1 Corinthians 11

**A BASIC READING OF THE TEXT IN ITS CONTEXT**

**C. Paul's Response to the Questions of Public Worship (11:2-34)**

**1. Male and Female in Worship before God (11:2-16)**

* The overall context of this chapter views the setting as public worship.
* The **structure of the section** is variously presented.

At this stage in our research, we are looking for a basic layout of the “facts”/flow of the text (if that is possible!). At this point, the highly disputed terms (identity of what = a “head cover” and “authority over”) and the various views are only engaged lightly.

Consider **Fee**'s (Pentecostal; Egalatarian) observations (1st edition 493-494; Revised edition 542ff.) on the structure of this text.

Three-part division: (see his block diagram of 11:3-16 which pictures the structure)

11:3-6 “…I want you to understand….”

11:7-12 Explanation of Man/Woman and “problem”

11:13-16 A call for discernment on Paul’s teaching

 **Fitzmyer**’s (Roman Catholic; probably Heirarchical) summary of flow (p.
 404-408):

* 11:3: Programmataic statement: Paul’s basic theological principle…read the text.

 11:4-6: Paul’s thesis set forth: the difference between the heads of men
 and woman in public prayer (a rhetorical contrast).

* 11:7-9: His explanatory argument that asserts the relation of woman to man.
* 11:10: Concluding statement: the woman’s obligation to have authority over her head (with an added reason, “because of the angels”)
* 11:11-12: Paul’s qualifying counterargument “in the Lord,” corresponding to vv. 7-9.
* 11:16: Admonition based on church discipline.

Fitzmyer’s further summary of his view of the meaning of this text flirts with his interpretive construct:

Fitzmyer’s paradigm of Paul’s argument (405-408)… Fitzmyer concludes Paul presenting **“five reasons why a woman should not pray or prophesy in a cultic assembly with uncovered head”:**

1. Biblically, the order of creation found in the Genesis story reveals that woman has been created “for man,” to be his companion and helper; hence as “the glory of man,” she should cover her head (vv. 7-12).
2. Theologically, the ordered headship of God, Christ, man, and woman calls for it (v. 3).
3. Sociologically, convention, based on “nature” itself, considers a woman’s uncovered head in such a situation as shameful and a disgrace (vv. 6, 13-15).
4. As a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, “the churches of God” have no such custom as uncovered heads of women at prayer in a cultic assembly (v. 16).
5. “because of the angels” (v. 10).

 **Garland**’s (Southern Baptist; Egalatarian) chiastic suggestion (p. 511, Garland’s section summaries are always profitable to read). Garland is careful to note that Paul “is not attempting to establish a gender hierarchy” in this text (tipping his hand, interpretive agenda?) but is merely ordering women in public worship within their cultural sensitivities (pp. 508-509).

A Commendation for maintaining the traditions handed on by Paul and the assertion of the basic principle that everyone has a head (11:2-3)
 B Shame about coverings for men and women (11:4-5)

 C Social impropriety for a woman to be uncovered; theological impropriety for a man to be covered (11:6-7)
 D Theological explanation from the creation account
 (11:8-9)
 E **Central assertion**: for this reason a woman ought to
 have authority over her head (11:10)

 D’ Theological caveat from procreation (11:11-12)

 C’ Social impropriety for a woman to be uncovered (11:13)

 B’ Shame (and glory): lessons from nature about coverings for men and women (11:14-15)

 A’ Admonition to conform to Paul’s customs and those of the churches of God (11:16)

* These three major interpreters of 1 Cor illustrate the flow of this text. But, the “devil is in the details” and there are several strongly held constructs that assert what the text means.

 **1. Male and Female in Worship before God (11:2-16) …Now the details
 of the text. [READ this text several times.]**

 1a. **The excellence of maintaining true traditions (11:2)**

The term translated “traditions” was used as a “**technical term** in Judaism for the oral transmission of religious instruction” (Fee, 499; see Chad Wiebe’s MA thesis in GRTS library).

These traditions (noun = **παράδoσις**) did not originate with Paul, but he "handed them down" (verb is from same stem as noun = παρέδωκα) to the churches. This term in its various forms is used in reference to tradition which is viewed as authoritative, whatever the tradition-history might be (see following citations for the variety of usage). The term παράδoσις, "traditions" (cf. noun use in Mk 7:9, 13, of men; Col 2:8, of men = Col. heresy; Gal 1:14, of Judaism; 1 Cor 11:2; 2 Thess 2:15; 3:6, true Christian tradition. The verb use in Luke 1:2), probably refers to the established oral teaching which was part of the early Christian pool of instruction. **This term normally implies an authoritative tradition (cf. 1 Cor 15:3).**

Paul presents created sex distinctions as canonical and non-negotiable (the prescriptive nature of παραδόσεις in 11:2). He views, however, the issue of cover as "customary" (the descriptive aspect of συvήθειαv in 11:16). Fee notes that the larger issue relates to the “shameful actions” of some women who were testing/challenging the historic distinctions between men and women. “Paul is willing to offer theological justification for maintaining a custom” *because* of the importance of the deeper issues (see Fee, 497-498).

The passage is not intended to lower the status of women (cf. e.g. 11:11, 12, 5). The text at the least promotes the right and freedom of women to participate in public worship as long as they do so in keeping with created distinctions. Paul "does not aim to silence Christian women but rather to guarantee that in their self-expression they were not denying an integral part of themselves" (Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 71). In this regard, one must ask `What was the original point which Paul intended to score?'

 2a. **The symbolism of the worshipper's head before God (11:3- 16)**

After 11:2, we enter an arena of vying interpretations on a number of items. Several
important details of the passage have been and are greatly debated and final compelling
resolution of the evangelical gender debate is not in hand. One must take all of the details and propose an understanding which is more probable (i.e. has less problems) than another.

As Fee summarized it, "Along with these larger contextual questions, this passage is full of notorious exegetical difficulties, including (1) the "logic" of the argument as a whole, which in turn is related to (2) our uncertainty about the meaning of some absolutely crucial terms and (3) our uncertainty about prevailing customs, both in the culture(s) in general and in the church(es) in particular (including the whole complex question of early Christian worship). Paul's response assumes understanding between them and him at several key points, and these matters are therefore not addressed. Thus the two crucial contextual questions, what was going on and why, are especially difficult to reconstruct" (492).

 1b. The biblical teaching of headship is stated (**11:3**).

Does the plain reading of 11:3 indicate that “head” is a prescriptive or descriptive item? How is “head”/ κεφαλὴ in 11:3 to be understood? Is it authority\heirarchical [subordination of women] or source/origin [woman proceeds from man]? This debate over “head” has poured over into the debate over “subordination” in reference to the Trinity. For example, in what sense would Christ be “sourced” in the Father if you take the “source” view? [See the bibliography and Systematic Theologies for the issue of the Trinity.]

The term translated as “head” (**κεφαλή**) is used 10 times in 11:3-10. Repetition should always perk up our interpretive senses.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TEXT**11:3 11:311:311:411:411:511:511:511:711:10 | **FORM/TRANSLATION (NRSV)**3 But I want you to understand that Christ is the **head** of every man, and the husband is the **head** of his wife, and God is the **head** of Christ.  4 Any man who prays or prophesies with something on his **head** disgraces his **head**,  5 but any woman who prays or prophesies with her **head** unveiled disgraces her **head**—it is one and the same thing as having her **head** shaved.7  For a man ought not to have his **head** veiled, since he is the image and reflection of God; but woman is the reflection of man.  10 For this reason a woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her **head**, because of the angels.   | **LITERAL OR METAPHOR**Metaphor Metaphor Metaphor Literal ? Metaphor ? Literal ? Metaphor ? Literal Literal Literal  |

* “Head” is used to signify three areas of relationships:

 Christ/Man Husband/Wife God/Christ

* The meaning of **κεφαλή:**

 **The Word-Study Approach (does not solve the question)**

* + Used to mean ‘ruler’ or ‘authority’(Grudem; Carson; Scheiner
		- This view has published “exhaustive” word studies that claim a use of “head” as source does not exist (see Grudem). Grudem has thrown out challenges to surface usages of kephale as source.
		- The view of ruler/authority results in a view of women as subordinate to men. Male leadership is the norm in home and Church.
	+ Used to mean ‘source,’ ‘origin’(Bedale; Bruce; Barrett; Fee; Murphy O-Connor; etc.)
		- While this view is slow to do the word studies, Troy W. Martin has taken up Grudem’s challenge and shown that indeed “head” is used in Greek literature to mean “source.”
			* CH *De natura pueri* 33,8-11: “The heart is the source (arche) of blood; the head [is the source] of phlegm; the spleen [is the source] of water; etc.” Cf. CH *De alimento* 30, 1-4.
			* Aristotle, *Problemata* 867a23-27: Why does the face sweat most? Is it because sweat passes most easily through parts which are rare and moist? And the head seems to be the source of moisture as it is due to the considerable moisture that the hair grows….” Cf. Aristotle *De partibus animalium* 656a31-34.
			* Martin goes further and reasonably demonstrates that the “heart” rather than the “head” is the “center of intelligence, reason,

thinking, and decision-making.” He goes on to say, “Specifying **κεφαλή** as ‘authority over’ as Grudem does is simply incompatible with Paul’s anthropology.” [Unpublished Paper, SBL 2007. It may be in the volumes on SBL papers.]

* + - The resulting view (egalitarianism) argues that women are equal to men in most domains of home and Church.
	+ While accumulating “proof” by words is helpful, it does not really solve “meaning” in 1 Cor 11. See 11:10 for more on this aspect.
* The metaphorical usages of “head” constitute the crucial items of interpretation. The meaning of “head” in its metaphorical translation is highly disputed. The dispute primarily revolves around the gender debate. Heirarchicalists and some Complementarians promote a translation of **“authority”** while Egalitarians argue for **“source.”** At times, one needs to step back and wonder if a modern agenda (gender debate) has over-ridden a plain reading of the text for the purpose of agenda hermeneutics. The “plain reading” of a text in its context and how it relates to the metanarrative context of the Bible must always be our first task.
* **Heirarchicalists** [I use this term rather than Complimentarians\* since it is more of a “middle road” term and always needs validation] **see this text as dependent upon a gender structure/relationship established in the Genesis cultural mandate**. The priority and order of 1 Cor 11 reflect **the “authority” of created distinctions for the purpose of gender distinctions.**
* **Egalitarians** (and some complementarians) **view that “Paul’s concern is** not heirarchical (who has authority over whom), but **relational** (“the unique relationships that are predicted on one’s being the source of the other’s existence.” Fee, 502-03). This does however, raise the problem of Christ sourced in God (Fee addresses “subordinationism”, 505). You will find in the gender debate literature items on the “subordination” controversy…referring to the theology of subordination in the Trinity and how it is used as a metaphor in the gender debate and, for some, whether it is a valid analogy. CBMW has gone so far as to claim CBE is flirting with a heresy.

**\*NOTE:** For some time, there has been a controversy over “who” owns the term “complementarian” in the gender debate. Many think that a certain group of heirarchicalists hijacked the term for themselves and gave it “their” meaning, which is not the preferred meaning in the history of the gender debate. This is easy to research online. Google Scot McKnight and the term “complementarian” and you will find plenty…be sure to read broadly and opposing views before jumping on anyone’s band wagon.

 2b. The teaching of headship is discussed (11:4-15).

 1c. The spiritual symbolism of the head in relation to male and female (11:4-10)

 The issues of men “uncovered” and women “covered.”

 1d. The application of the symbolism in the Corinthian assembly (11:4-6)

11:4 How do men dishonor their “head” if covered in the assembly?

I always wondered about this issue since the OT High Priest never went into the Holy of Holies without a cover and Orthodox Jewish men wear a Yamaka (“skull cap”). I would recommend Richard Oster’s article as a reasonable answer to this issue. Corinth was a Roman colony. When Roman men worshiped, especially the “elite,” they would pull their “Toga” up over their head in homage to the deity (note statues, pictures of Roman priests and Caesars). This “devotional gesture [was] known as *capite velato*, usd by both permanent Roman clergy and by officiating laymen, that provides the matrix for the devotional apparel mentioned in 1 Corinthians 11.4” (p. 496). Consequently, if Christian men were “covered” in such a manner in worship, they would appear to be syncretistic with Roman Religion.

Unfortunately, there is little attention paid to men in this chapter since everyone wants to get the women in line !! See David Gill’s article for expansion of the man issue.

11:5 How do women dishonor their “head” if Uncovered in the assembly?

The terminology for "cover" varies and is perhaps different than one might expect if "veil" is intended (the Greek for veil is κάλυμμα, and it never occurs in a simple usage in 1 Cor 11 but is usually in compounded forms). Two issues: Nature of “cover” and of the “metaphor”

κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων / ‘having down the head’ (11:4)

ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ / ‘with uncovered head’ (11:5, 13)

 ἀκατακαλύπτος (adj)

 κατακαλύπτεται (11:6)

 κατακαλύπτεσθαι (11:70; cf. Plutarch, ‘Advice...’, 138D, τὴν νύμφην κατακαλύψαντες, a ceremony for veiling the bride)

 ἡ κόμη ἀντὶ περιβoλαίoυ δέδoται [αὐτῇ] (11:15)
 “the hair instead of a ‘covering’ has been given”

At the same time, these terms are used for “veiling,” which “was the social indicator by which

the marital status of a woman was made clear to everyone” (Winter, *After*, 127). Oster refers to Plutarch’s *Aetia Romana et Graeca*, “which discusses the Roman custom of wearing head coverings in liturgical settings.” (484-485) Once again, NT scholarship often neglects Roman sources and primary sources in the reconstruction of texts. Also, Plutarch’s “Advice to the Bride and Groom” talks about “veiling the bride” using a form of κατακαλύπτεται (Winter, *After*, 127). So a headcovering is solidly a part of signaling a married woman in Roman culture.

Oster continues his critique of poor historical work on ll:4 and the variety of terms/phrase for the “cover” by saying:

“Examples of κατὰ with the genitive case undermine the foundation of Murphy-O’Connor’s contention. When describing individuals wearing head coverings, Plutarch uses the Greek phrase κατὰ κεφαλῆς in a way similar to the conventional understanding of 1 Corinthians 11. 4 and demonstrates that **κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων can refer to something resting on the head.** [emphasis mine] The Greek phrase does not have to denote hair flowing down the back of the head and neck. Greek literature contemporary with the New Testament demonstrates that the phrase κατὰ κεφαλῆς can clearly mean ‘on the head’.” (486)

The bottom line seems to be that Paul is criticizing a woman breaking protocol for whatever reason. Again, I am more impressed with explanations that tie the text to its own time and place. Oster, Gill and Winter (*Roman Wives….*) provide a context to see that the public worship was being invaded by some Roman cultural norms, even new ones, that were not good for the Christian assembly.

Oster has provided a compelling argument to explain the men in 1 Cor 11, a matter neglected by virtually all commentaries along with a common neglect of historical-cultural features of a Roman colony (See Oster in.loc.). If we explain the cover in relation to men as culturally driven, then should not the same pattern be used to explain the issue of women?

Here are some interpretations proposed concerning the nature of the cover for women. This
list illustrates a basis for the “validation” of the issue. See the bibliography for the sources
cited.

 1a. The cover is a veil/hat type item which is still binding (held by: Waltke)

 2a. The cover was a veil/hat type item for cultural reasons which is no longer binding (held by: Wilson, *BibSac* 148 [1991]).

3a. The cover is a women's long hair (held by: William Martin)

4a. The cover is related to how hair is fixed on the head (held by: Murphy O’Connor, Isaksson, Hurley, Padgett, Thompson, Hays (?). Cf. Fee note 17 p. 496 for additional bib).

5a. The cover is related to certain cultural aspects of Roman religion with application to both men and women (held by: Oster, cf. Gill).

6a. The cover, especially its absence, relates to the “new Roman women” problem and is therefore culturally bound (held by: Winter).

This brief survey of the issues which this text raises should sober any interpreter. It should also indicate that dogmatism is not in keeping with the interpretation of 1 Cor 11:2-16. It is also a lesson in hermeneutics as to how each view, using the same texts, presents evidence for how they explain each of the problematic words and phrases.

 2d. Is the origin of such symbolism intrinsic to God's created pattern (11:7- 10)?

Meaning of δόξα / “glory” in 11:7. “Glory” relates to men and women’s relationship to God’s creation pattern of being created in his image (Gen 1:27).

**διὰ τοῦτο** / “on account of **this**” (11:10)--connection back or forward? (See Morna Hooker)

 “Back” = the reason for 11:10 is in 10:7-9. The “glory” of men and women is to live in light of being created in God’s image. The Creation narrative and 1 Cor focus on man/God, woman/man. As Hooker images it:
 Man is the glory of God,
 Therefore his head must be bare.
 Woman is the glory of man,
 Therefore her head must be covered.

διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς/ “for this reason the woman has authority on her head” (11:10). Does on/ἐπὶ mean location or control (over)? [cf. Lk 1:17]

Consider an array of translations for interpretation!

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| KJV: For this cause ought the woman to **have power on *her* head** because of the angels | ESV: That is why a wife ought to **have a symbol of authority on her head**, because of the angels. | NASB: Therefore the woman ought **to have *a symbol of* authority on her head**, because of the angels. | NIV: For this reason, and because of the angels, the woman ought **to have a sign of authority on her head**. | TNIV: It is for this reason that a woman ought **to have authority over her own head**, because of the angels.2011 = same | NLT: So a woman should wear a **covering on her head as a sign of authority** because the angels are watching. |

The **traditional view** is to ADD “symbol” or “sign” to explain the image that the woman is

“under authority,” namely, the man’s. **But** this imports the modern gender debate into this text and skews the imagery of Genesis/Paul. Paul is not trying to marginalize the female nor glorify the male…each has glory in their appointed relationship to God. Man does not cover his head in worship because **he is** the “glory” of God; the woman covers her head because **she is** the “glory” of man within the larger biblical narrative. Each has power in this Creation imagery. Morna Hooker summarizes it this way:

“In the same way, the obligation which lies upon the woman is based on the fact that she is the glory of the man. In her case, therefore, her uncovered head will reflect his [i.e. man’s] glory, both because she is his ‘glory’, and because he is her ‘head’. It is for this reason that the judgement in her case is different; her head must be covered, not because she is in the presence of man, but because she is in the presence of God and his angels—and in their presence the glory of man must be hidden. If she were to pray or prophesy with uncovered head, she would not be glorifying God, but reflecting the glory of man, and in God’s presence this must inevitably turn to shame.” (Hooker, 415)

Hooker notes that in the Second Temple Jewish literature/tradition, “the angels worshipped Adam at the creation.” Perhaps in 1 Cor, “Paul thinks there is a danger that the angels might be misled into worshipping man if his ‘glory’ is displayed.” (415)

So how is the “cover” an “authority”? Again, Hooker’s analysis cuts through the modern gender debate and allows Paul to speak: “Once again, the answer may lie in Paul’s use of the word δόξα [glory, 11:7]. Since the words ‘glory’ and ‘worship’ are to some extent synonymous, to be the glory of God is in itself to worship him. According to Paul, however, it is man, and not woman, who is the glory of God, and who will therefore naturally play the active role in wowrship: if now woman also, in contrast to Jewish custom, takes part in prayer and prophecy, this is because a new power has been given to her…. Yet now woman, too, speaks to God in prayer and declares his word in prophecy: to do this she needs authority and power from God. The head-covering which symbolizes the effacement of man’s glory in the presence of God also serves as the sign of the ἐξουσίαν which is given to the woman; With the glory of man hidden she, too, may reflect the glory of God. **Far from being a symbol of the woman’s subjection to man, therefore, her head-covering is what Paul calls it—authority: in prayer and prophecy she, like the man, is under the authority of God”** [emphasis mine]. (Hooker 415-416; cf. Thiselton’s support for Hooker’s analysis 835-841).

Winter: “There is an interesting variant on “authority”/ἐξουσίαν in a few manuscripts. The Vulgate, Coptic, and a variety of early church fathers (e.g. Ptolemy, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine and Bede) substitute κάλυμμα, ᾱτος, τό (the actual Greek word for veil which never even appears in 1 Cor 11 as a noun) for ἐξουσίαν. This is only an insight into historical views since the great preponderance of manuscript evidence maintains ἐξουσίαν as the original reading.

**11:10 διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, “on account of the angels” …** This is best understood via the Angels as the caretakers of created pattern and also in the domain of worship, the “glory of man must be hidden, and the woman must wear a covering on her head….” (Hooker, 415)

 2c. The created relationship between male and female (11:11-12).

 BOTH male and female are under God.

 3c. The argument from nature (11:13-15)

Is 11:15b an argument from analogy or identity?

Fee argues that “Paul is arguing by analogy that since women have by ‘nature’ been given long hair as a covering [not in lieu of], that in itself points to their need to be ‘covered’ when praying and prophesying” (Fee, 529). Thus, hair is not the cover but **an analogical argument** to be covered.

 3b. The Conclusion (11:16)

A problem exists in the translation/reading of this verse. ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν…

 KJV/ASV/NRSV "We have no such custom"

 NASB/NIV(x2)/ "We have no other custom"

* On the surface, this variation of translation begs for a difference in meaning. The term translated “custom” is clear, but the modifier τοιαύτην is the focus. BDAG lexicon renders it as “such” (1009c).
* “Custom” is “a conscious practice of a collectivity” (Judge, in Winter Festschrift, 178).
* Two views about what “custom” references:
	+ Is it the practice Paul is criticizing? (= “no such”)
	+ Or, is it a support of the “traditions” of 11:2? (= “no other”)
* Judge seems to argue that Paul’s delineation of Worship may contain some “conventions” that served the “tradition” that was established.
* The “Joe Friday” (= the facts and nothing but the facts) or Commentators is Fitzmyer. He tersely comments:

“16. *If anyone is inclined to be argumentative (about this), we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God.* Paul is aware that his complicated arguments about this problem may not be convincing to everyone. So, in effect, he appeals to Christian church discipline or custom (or what whould later be called canon law); and Schussler Fiorenza rightly calles it “an authoritarian appeal”….” (421). Fitzmyer’s Roman Catholic connections shine through here, but the analogy may be insightful. After all, Paul was an apostle.

* Other commentaries point out that Paul’s seeming “concession” is to the issue of the contentious nature of the historic Corinthian context. While Paul would not compromise on the Creation motif, he may have been open to allowing a variety on how that motif is upheld in worship…namely, the seeming argument over the use of

the “cover” cannot trump the reality of the metanarrative AND the fact that all the other churches are “in line” with his teaching. “That alone should cause them to take stock and rethink their own practices.” (Garland, 532)

Perhaps most **important is to contrast the “tradition” delivered in 11:2 with the “custom” (συνήθειαν) noted in 11:16**. How do you account for what seems to be a stark change of language? The tone of the argument in 11:2-16 is markedly different than 11:17-34 and chs. 12-14. 11:2-16 flows from praise to discussion to propriety in 11:13. 11:17-34 contains no praise but unequivocally commands certain actions.

BRAIN TEASER… If Paul were writing this section today, how would he frame it?

**HISTORICAL-CULTURAL RECONSTRUCTION AS A BACKGROUND TO THE TEXT**

The work of the Tyndale scholar Bruce Winter on Roman backgrounds for the first century A.D. has provided a better historical-cultural focus for many texts in 1 Corinthians. The following analysis reflects Winter’s reconstruction for 1 Corinthians 11:2-16.

* When men wore veils (cf. 11:4, 7)! The articles by Oster (see bib. below) and Gill (*Tyndale Bulletin* 1990:245-260) demonstrate that “veiling” was a practice for both men and women in Roman society. Winter reflects on how this pattern is reflected by Roman emperors who led cultic activity and was also true for the ‘social elite’ in Corinth who fulfilled this cultic function (121-123). These Roman officials pulled their toga head covering up over their head when officiating a religious ceremony and perhaps civic or legal events as well. Winter reasons that if the high status practiced this in the Christian assembly when prophesying, then perhaps the lower status followed suit and thus pagan syncretism and social status conflict might arise.
* The Greek term γυνή can be translated either “woman” or “wife.” It is contextually dependent. The context of 1 Cor 11 requires that it be translated

wife. The mention of a “veil” and the headship analogy requires it (cf. Winter, 126-27). Plutarch’s “Advice to the Bride and Groom” (138d) indicates that a woman began to practice veiling with marriage. So this text is addressing husbands and wives in public worship, not men and women generically.

* “New Roman Wives” senario. There is adequate evidence to posit that women of high status, fed up with a sexual double standard for males (e.g. banquet scene) and their legal wives, decided to create ‘new patterns’ of social and sexual behavior (reflected in 1 Cor 5?). The “bedroom speech” given to newlyweds (e.g. Plutarch) with its demand that the wife accept the male’s ‘casual sexual encounters’ in social settings such as Roman banquets, finally

became intolerable for the wives and a revolt occurred. The reality of the new women and their behavior evidently prompted Caesar Augustus to put forth new legislation with severe penalties to save Rome’s male oriented view of “family values.” The legislation seems to have failed (Winter, *After*, 123-126).

 See Bruce W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003. Winter provides some important bibliography for Roman dress.

* While married women veiled themselves in public, they probably did not do so in the privacy of their homes. The Corinthian Church met in private homes. Were some not veiling when the church met? The unveiled wife is an affront, as Paul clearly indicates in 11:5-6. “Paul equated not wearing a veil with the social stigma of a publicly exposed and punished adulteress reduced to the status of a prostitute” (Winter, 128). Perhaps Paul was trying to distinguish Christian wives from the new Roman woman. Therefore, a typical social convention was maintained to avoid ‘guilt by association.’ The veil was not created for a religious or created pattern purpose, it was an issue in the culture that could undermine the ethics of the church.
* In 11:7, 10, Paul used a prominent and strong Greek verb that signified ethical obligation. Both husbands and wives were to demonstrate the high status of marriage by means of certain social conventions. Men were not to be veiled and thereby reflect syncretism with Roman authorities and cultic practices. For the wife, the most obvious sign of marriage was the wearing of the veil (11:10a). Therefore ‘she was obliged to have the authority [or sign of marriage] on the head’. Paul is not saying here that the husband as head ‘exercises authority’ over his wife, otherwise he would have used the verb ἐξουσιάζω; simply that the woman is obliged to wear on her head that which signified to all and sundry that she was married. (Winter, 131)
* Paul’s reference to “nature” in 11:14 reflects the mindset of his time. The philosophers of his time (e.g. Stoics including Philo) appealed to “nature” as a teacher of culture. For a man to wear long hair indicated a ‘denial of their masculinity’ and tagged them as homosexuals. “All first-century cultures

 possessed means by which the polarity of the sexes was defined with various
 conventions; hair length was one such feature in Roman Corinth, as 11:14-15
 accurately noted” (Winter, 133). What is left in our culture to
 “signal”/symbolize marriage?

* The regular public gatherings of the early church for cultic practices were a different pattern from the religious practices of pagan religions. Except for special days to honor Rome, religion was practiced privately in the first century. The Christians were an odd lot to their pagan neighbors. They met corporately on a weekly basis. They used a political term for their gathering

(ἐκκλησία). They had no iconic representation of their God present (this brought a charge of atheism!!). The gathered church was first called “Christians” (Χριστιανoί) by the Romans as Acts 11:26 reflects. The Jew’s would not have used such a term and it also has a Latin suffix (-*ianus*), which was used in political jargon. This label is a perception of outsiders about believers in Christ. How groups in antiquity perceive themselves and how they are perceived by outsiders is a fascinating study.

See Sanders, E. P. editor. *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*. 3 volumes. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

**INFORMATION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH ON GENDER ISSUES IN 1 CORINTHIANS 11**

While there are many texts to address the role of women in redemptive history, the battle (militaristic language is not a hyperbole with this domain!) in American Evangelicalism has usually revolved around 1 Corinthians 11:2-16; 14:33b-36 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

**Gender Trajectories in American Evangelicalism**

 There are three major variations: Heirarchicalism, Complementarianism; Egalatarianism (although Heirarchicalism is usually avoided by those who are H and the term Complementarianism is used by them. See Scott McKnight’s analysis of the use of this term.). The lines of distinction between views is not always “clean.”

* The first two views (H and C) are primarily represented by the organization (with exceptions):

 **The Council for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood**

 ([www.cbmw.org](http://www.cbmw.org))

 Published The Danvers Statement in 1988 (attached)

* The third view (Egalatarianim) is primarily represented by the organization (with exceptions):

 **Christians for Biblical Equality** ([www.cbeinternational.org](http://www.cbeinternational.org))

 See CBE “Statement of Faith” (very brief, see their website for articles of support)

The websites of these two organizations provide prolific bibliography and pdf resources for their views of biblical texts and theological constructs.

**PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE PROVIDED FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES AND CONVENIENCE. THEIR PRESENCE IS NOT AN ENDORSEMENT FOR ONE OR THE OTHER VIEW.**

The more elaborate statement by CBMW is not to be assumed to be better than the brief statement by CBE. CBE provides plenty of support for its views via their website.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* ATTACHMENTS: \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

(1) DANVERS STATEMENT;

(2) CBE “STATEMENT OF FAITH”

**DANVERS STATEMENT BY CBMW 1988**

(Not finished – final copy in Policy & Procedures Manual)

**The Role of Women in Leadership in the Home and the Church**

**Position and Policy Statement of Faith Evangelical Free Church, Tempe AZ**

Both in our culture and in our church the changing role of women is impossible to ignore. The desire for equality of women in the workplace has often been founded on inexcusable inequalities. Women have often not been treated with the dignity that they are due. This desire for equality has also spilled over into the church and raised the question of what roles women should play in churches in our culture.

These questions have been asked both on a national level and also within our own church. The Elders of Faith Evangelical Free Church (FEFC), therefore, have been wrestling with this question for approximately the last four years. We have wrestled long and hard because we want to avoid any error that might be inherent in the evangelical tradition or the more egalitarian mood of our culture. Above all we want to please God in this matter and be faithful to His teaching in the Scripture. This document is not intended to answer all questions concerning male and female roles and relationships. We were concerned primarily with the role of women in leadership and teaching at FEFC.

**The Danvers Statement**, written by the **Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood in 1988** was evaluated by the Elders and found to be acceptable for use as a guide in preparing this position and policy statement.

**Position Statement**

**ARTICLES OF AFFIRMATION AND DENIAL**

**Article I**

**A. We affirm that both men and women are created in God's image, equal before God as persons and possessing identical standing and spiritual privilege; yet they are distinct in their manhood and womanhood.**

Genesis 1 teaches the equality of the sexes as God's image-bearers (v. 27) and vice-rulers of the earth (v. 28). Moses first asserts the divine creation of man: "So God created man in His image". Then he inverts the order of this phrase to put emphasis on the divine image in man, "In the image of God He created him". In the next phrase, "male and female He created them," we learn that this creation and divine image are expressed in two sexes. Both men and women display the glory of God's image with equal brilliance.[[4]](#endnote-1)1

Equality (image-bearers) and difference (masculinity and femininity) are equally the result of God's creative activity and order. Both facets of creation come to their rightful expression with neither negating the other.[[5]](#endnote-2)2

Equal possession of the divine image clearly implies the equal worth of men and women, their equal standing before God and their identical spiritual privilege. Galatians 3:28 declares that there is "neither male or female" for both are "one in Jesus Christ." As the context makes clear, both are equally justified by faith (v. 24), equally children of God (v. 26), equally clothed with Christ (v. 27), equally belonging to Christ (v. 29), and equally heirs to the promise (v.29).

**B. We deny that equality of personhood (essence) demands equality of function.3**

Numerous examples from Scripture and from life illustrate situations where individuals differ in function (role) yet are equal in essence (intrinsic value). Parent/child and employer/employee relationships are situations where roles differ, yet neither member of the relationship has any more or less value in the sight of God. Paul emphasizes in 1 Cor 12 that we all (Jews or Greeks, slaves or free) have been baptized into one Body and made to drink into one Spirit (v. 13) and immediately gives the analogy of the Body of Christ to the human body. Not all parts of the human body have the same function, and neither do all parts of the Body of Christ have the same function (vs. 15-26). Note the relationship between elders (the human leaders of a local church) and other believers in the church; while there is a distinction in their responsibilities before God, we would deny any difference in their value or standing before God.

The idea of separating essence from function is further expressed in the analogy of the Trinity. How the members of the Godhead relate to one another is analogous to the male/female relationship as God designed it. The three persons of the Trinity are absolutely equal in essence, but distinct in function. Specifically, their distinction of function is marked by an intrinsic relation of authority within the Trinity by which the Son is subject to the Father and the Spirit to the Father and Son. The clearest example of Christ's subjection to the Father is 1 Cor 15:28 where the exalted and victorious Son "will also be subject to the One who subjects all things to Him." Given this understanding of the Trinity, it makes sense for Paul to say what he does in 1 Cor 11:3. Here he speaks of three line of authority that exist: Christ is the authority (head) over every man, the man is the authority (head) over a woman, and God (the Father) is the authority (head) over Christ. Just as the persons of God are equal in essence

and yet they relate within a structure of authority, so too men and women are equal in essence and relate within a similar structure of authority.

Article II

**A. We affirm that male and female role distinctions were purposefully designed into creation with the intent of forming a complementary relationship in which the man functions as the head and the woman as the helper.**

Male and female role distinctions are part of God's original design and find their origin in the creation narrative. In Genesis 2 and 3, we first find support for the assertion that in relationships the male partner bears the primary responsibility for leadership while the female has the responsibility to respect and support her partner.

The first indication of role differentiation is that man was created before woman. He was the "firstborn" and hence had a natural precedence by birth. The New Testament writers saw decisive importance in this birth sequence. For instance, according to Paul, woman's submission to man is grounded in man being created first (1 Tim 2:12-13; 1 Cor 11:8-9).

The second indication of role differentiation is that woman was created to be a "helper" for the man (Gen 2:18-20). The woman was made from the man (her sameness) and for the man (her difference). Some contend that the word translated helper *(ezer)* cannot imply submission because it is sometimes used in reference to God "helping" His people. But a word can have a different nuance of meaning depending on how it is used. If we allow Scripture to interpret itself, we find that this particular use of *ezer* does imply submission. For instance, in 1 Cor 11:9 Paul affirms that "man was not created for the woman's sake, but woman for the man's sake" and thus uses Genesis to support his assertion that man is the authority (head) of the woman (I Cor 11:3). However, to say that woman was created for the man's sake does not necessarily mean that the woman exists only for the sake of man. Paul is quick to put forth the other half of the human equation, "For the woman originates from the man, so also the man has his birth through the woman." (I Cor 11:12), thus establishing their mutual interdependence.

**B. We deny that headship/submission distinctions are an effect of the Fall from which redeemed men and women should seek liberation.**

The headship/submission role distinction is commended by the New Testament writers for the proper ordering of relationships. Paul exhorts wives, *"be* subject to your husbands" (Col 3:18). Assuming the goodness of this action, he then adds "as is fitting in the Lord." Peter concurs and commends wives for being submissive to their own husbands by likening them to "holy women of former times who hoped in God" (1 Pet 3:5). He concludes his comments by stressing that to model these holy submissive women is to "do what is right" (v. 6).

Headship/submission role distinctions for men and women are not only proper but, Paul implies, their permanence. In texts concerning headship/submission relationships he appeals to permanent relationships including God the Father's

headship over the Son (1 Cor 11:3); Christ's headship over the church and the church's submission to Him (Eph 5:23,24); and the order and purpose of creation (woman was made from man and for man's sake) and its significance (2 Cor 11:8-9, 1 Tim 2:13-14; see Gen 2:18-24). It is important to note that the apostle's basis for headship is grounded in the nature of the Godhead, the mystery of the church, and the pre-Fall creation order (Gert 2), not the Fallen Order (Gen 3).
order (Gen 3).

What the fall did introduce was distortions into already existing functions that had been deemed good. The man's work was altered from cultivating the garden (Gert 2:15) to toiling in sweat for his provision (Gen 3:17-19). Fruitful childbearing (Gen 1:28) became "in pain you shall bring forth children" (Gen 3:16a); and the headship/submission partnership was distorted into a domination/usurpation power play (Gen 3:16b).

While many women today need release from male domination, the liberating alternative is not female rivalry or autonomy but male headship complemented to female help. Christian redemption does not redefine creation; it restores creation, so that wives learn godly submission and husbands learn godly headship.[[6]](#endnote-3)4

Article III

**A. We affirm that both the Old and New Testaments teach the principle of male headship in the family and church community, and manifest the equally high value and dignity which God attached to the roles of both men and women.**

The women of Israel enjoyed a status found among few cultures of the ancient world. The high value and dignity placed on womanhood is best conveyed in Proverbs 31's portrait of a virtuous woman. Here the ideal woman is described as a trusted companion (v. 11-12) and her husband's greatest asset (v. 10). She is an able manager of the household, providing oversight of the servants (v. 15), and a shrewd business woman, operating her own in-house investments (v. 24) and real estate ventures for a profit (v. 16).

Just as in domestic affairs women also retained a high standing in religious matters. Not just men, but women also experienced direct contact with God (Judges 13:3ff;Gen 16:7ff; 21:17) and answers to prayer(Gen 25:21;ISam 12:8-20). They took part in worship and religious festivities, especially the Passover (Ex 12:3ff). Women, like men, could swear oaths (Ruth 1:17), and take vows of spiritual consecration (Num 6:2). The prophetic office was also open to women. The Scriptures are replete with prophetesses who achieved distinction, such as Miriam (Ex 15:20); Huldah, who was a counselor to King Josiah (Il Kings 22:14-20); and Deborah, who functioned as a judge over Israel (Judges 4:4-5).

Later Jesus would break with some of the oppressive customs of His day and elevate women to a place of value and spiritual privilege equal to men. Jesus demonstrated the intrinsic value of women as persons by regularly addressing them directly and compassionately in public. This was unusual for a man to do (Jn 4:27). Jesus welcomed it when, like the men, women joined in being instructed by Him (Luke 10:38-42). There were no role distinctions when it came to learning from Christ. In addition, Jesus accorded dignity to women by allowing them to participate in His life and ministry. They anointed Him (Luke 7:36-50; Mk 14:3-99); prepared meals (Luke 10:40); ministered financially (Luke 8:2-3). They often traveled with Jesus and were the first witnesses to the resurrection (Mt 28:5-8; Mk 16:5-8; Luke 24:2-9; Jn 20:1-2). It is evident in both testaments that though the activities of most women primarily centered around home and family, their special

gifts and abilities gave them an extended influence in the larger community for the benefit of all.

Though women shared equally in spiritual privileges, definite differences did exist in their spiritual activities. What we don't find women doing is as significant as what we do find them doing. For example, where are the women priests? The law restricted the priesthood to men in sharp contrast to the practices of the surrounding nations (Ex 28-29; Lev 8-9). Where are the women heads of tribes of Israel, women kings of Israel (Athaliah wrongly usurped the throne), women apostles (Junia of Rom 16:7 is highly disputed), women elders in the early church? The point is that at the level of highest human religious authority, the Bible gives a clear and uniform picture of male leadership. The most notable exception to the above rule is Deborah (Judges 4-5), who was both prophetess and judge of Israel. Given the Iow spiritual state of Israel at the time, most see Judges not to illustrate well God's ideal for His people. Possibly, then Deborah's judgeship shows not how God endorses female leadership, but rather just how far from God's design and purposes Israel had strayed. In any case, it is difficult to accept the case of Deborah as normative in light of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary?

**B. We deny that male and female authority distinctions are the result of unique problems or cultural circumstances of the early church.6**

Both the household codes (Eph 5:22-6:9; Col 3:18-4:1; I Peter 2:13-3:7) and the church codes (1 Cor 11:2-16; 1 Cor 14:33-36; 1 Tim 2:8-15)assert that the man, as the head, is to provide the primary leadership, while the woman is called to a role of respect and support. The commands of Scripture ["Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord...Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself for it" (Eph 5:22 and 25); "wives, be submissive to your own husbands" (1 Pet 3:1); 'The head of woman is man" (1 Cor 11:3); "1 do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man" (1 Tim 2:12)] are not grounded in timebound, culturally relative arguments that apply only to Paul's day and age, but in the way God created man and woman to relate to each other as male and female.

Those who contend that the New Testament writers are either addressing unique situations in the church or conforming to cultural patterns of the day will find little if any support from the texts themselves. All the relevant New Testament texts that deal with the submission of women to men, as well as the various practices delineating the roles of the sexes are listed below, along with the reasons the apostolic writers give for their teachings. Of the 24 reasons, only one (the comparison with hair--1 Cor 11:5-6, 14-15) could be considered an appeal to something cultural. The rest fall into five main categories:

1) An appeal to authority, either that of Christ, the apostle, or the universal practice of the churches (Eph 5:21; Col 1:18; 1 Cor 11:2 and 3, 16; 1 Cor 14:37-38; 1 Tim 2:12),

2) The example of a model person (Eph 5:22-30; 1 Pet 3:4-5; 1 Cor 11:3),

3) Practical reasons leading to Christian goals, obtaining conversion to Christ, and freer worship of God (1 Pet 3:1-2, 7),

4) Women as the weaker vessel (1 Pet 3:7; 1 Tim 2:14), and

5) Revealed realities showing God's purposes and intentions (Eph 5:22-31; 1 Pet 3:7; 1 Cor 11:7-12; 1 Tim 2:13-14).

In short, the view that the New Testament teaching on men and women derives from "special situations of the early church" is a hypothesis unsupported by the key texts.

Article IV

**A. We affirm that redemption in Christ aims at removing authority distortions introduced by the fall, while maintaining authority distinctions in the marriage relationship.**

In the home, the husband's loving, humble headship tends to be replaced by domination or passivity while the wife's intelligent, willing submission tends to be replaced by usurpation or servility. Neither extreme is proper; the husband should forsake harsh or selfish leadership and grow in love and care for his wife. The wife, likewise, should forsake resistance to her husband's authority and grow in willing, joyful submission to her husband's leadership.

The primary text for establishing and defining male headship in marriage is Ephesians 5:22-33 where the central teaching includes the wife's submission to the husband and the husband's love for his wife. The exhortation is first addressed to the woman: "wives be subject to your own husbands." The submission called for is one in which the wife is to honor and affirm her husband's leadership and help carry not to do so grudgingly, but willingly dedication and disposition to yield to the Lord. it through according to her gifts. She is *"as* unto the Lord" (v. 22) with a her husband's guidance as she would to the Lord.

Corresponding to the wife's responsibility to submit to her husband is the husband's responsibility to love her: "Husbands love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself up for her" (Eph 5:25). For the husband the call to Christ-like leadership is followed with a command to express Christ-­like love. It is a "give-yourself-up-for-her" love, expressed as service to one's wife. The God-ordained combination of loving leadership and respectful submission strengthens the oneness of the marriage union and enhances the unity of the marriage relationship through the mutual expression of complementary roles.

**B. We deny that the command to "submit to one another" in Eph 5:21 calls for a type of mutual submission that eliminates authority distinctions in the marriage relationship.7**

It is doubtful that Paul had "mutual" submission in mind in Eph 5:21; (that is the kind of reciprocity that would rule out male headship in the marriage relationship). The reason is based on the nature of the word "submit" (hupotasso). The term, when used to describe interpersonal

relationships, is never mutual in its force. It is always one-directional, implying a relationship of submissions to an authority.

It is used elsewhere in the New Testament of the submission of Jesus to the authority of His parents (Luke 2:51); of demons being subject to the disciples (Luke 10:17); of citizens being subject to governing authorities (Rom 13:1,5; Titus 3:1); of servants being subject to their masters (Titus 2:9; I Pet 2:18); and of Christians being subject to God (Heb 12:9; James 4:7). At no time are the lines of authority in these relationships ever reversed.

So why is the mutual submission interpretation so common? It is common because many interpreters assume that the pronoun "one another" (allelous) must be completely reciprocal (that it must mean everyone to everyone). But that is not the case in all of its uses, and since it is joined to the word hupotasso in this case, it is unlikely that it has that meaning here. There are times where "one another" (allelous) means some to others; for example, in Rev 6:4, "so that men should slay one another" means that some will slay others; or in Cot 11:33, "when you come together to eat, wait for one another" means some who are there should wait for others to arrive; etc. (cf. Gal 6:1-2, Luke 2:15, 24:32). Therefore, it would be best to say that it is not mutual submission but submission to appropriate authorities that Paul is commanding in Eph 5:21. One could paraphrase v. 21 to read, "Those of you who are under authority should submit to others in authority over you."

This view is consistent with the structure of Eph 5:21-6:5. Paul begins with this general summary statement some should submit to others (v. 21). Then he spells out the specifics: wives submit to your own husbands (v. 22 and 24), children obey your parents (6:1), and slaves obey your masters (6:5). Furthermore, this view parallels Peter's approach when he urges Christians, "submit yourselves for the Lord's sake to every authority instituted among men ..." (I Pet 2:13), and then spells this out in terms of the submission of servants (2:18ff) and wives (3:1ff).

It should also be noted that the "some to others" principle of submission does away with the erroneous notion that all women are to submit to all men. The Biblical injunction is that wives are to submit to husbands, and that men and women in general are to submit to appropriate authorities in the church, home and state.

**Article V**

**A. We affirm that redemption in Christ aims at removing authority distortions introduced by the fall while maintaining authority distinctions between men and women in the church.**

Sin inclines men toward a worldly love of power or an abdication of spiritual responsibility and leads women to resist limitations on their roles or to neglect the use of their gifts in appropriate ministries. Redemption in Christ, however, gives men and women an equal share in the blessing of salvation. Yet, in keeping with the principle of male headship, some governing and teaching roles within the church are restricted to men. Several specific passages in Scripture are important in delineating these roles:

**I Tim 2:9-15**

This passage is concerned with the way women are to conduct themselves in the household of God (1 Tim 3:15) with special emphasis on how they are to express their submission. Paul instructs Christian women that an attitude of submission is outwardly expressed through a modest appearance (1 Tim 2:9) and the adornment of good deeds (v 10). Paul then goes on to emphasize the inward condition of the heart by insisting that "a woman should learn in quietness and full submission" (v 1 1). Though the term "quietness" can mean silence in an absolute sense, it can also convey the idea of peaceableness. The idea here is that a woman should possess a teachable disposition that is uncontentious, peaceable and willing to learn. Paul adds that they are to learn in "full submission" (v 1 1), yielding to those in authority as is proper.

Next, Paul transitions from what women are encouraged to do, namely learn, to what they are prohibited from doing. He unequivocally states, "but I do not permit a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet" (v 12). Of course, Paul does not prohibit Christian women from all teaching and leadership. Elsewhere he instructs older women are to teach younger women (Titus 2:3-4), and mothers to teach their children (2 Tim 1:5, 3:15). What Paul prohibits (see attached Policy Statement, Section 1) is women teaching and exercising authority over men.

The word "authentein" translated here as "exercise authority" is the subject of much discussion. It appears only here in the New Testament, so no Scriptural background exists from which to determine its meaning. Some look to its root meaning and argue that it conveys the idea of exercising authority autocratically, as in "to domineer" or "lord over." Thus, they claim that Paul is not denying women authority over men, but rather women are simply not to dominate men in a wrongful way. The major objection to this interpretation stems from studies of "authenteo" in extra-biblical literature closest in time and nature to 1 Timothy. The most extensive studies confirm that the primary meaning of the term is "exercise authority" or "dominate" in the neutral sense of "to have dominion over" not in the negative sense of "to lord it over".

In addition, the overall construction of the passage seems to favor the primary usage of the term. In instructing women on what they should do (learn in submission) and should not do (teach and have authority), Paul draws a contrasting parallel of opposites that intentionally links learning with teaching and submission with authority. Had Paul only been concerned with women abusing their authority over men and not merely having authority over men, why does he call them to the role of learner and withhold from them the role of teacher? Why does he call them to exercise "full submission" rather than proper authority?

Paul gives two reasons for his prohibitions: First, "Adam was formed first and then Eve" (v 13) and second, it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being quite deceived, fell into sin (v 14).

The first statement stresses that the order in which God created man and woman is significant. It expresses and determines the order of authority God intended within the relationship. The one formed first is to lead and the one formed after and from the first is to yield to his leadership. The second statement is less clear and has therefore lent itself to various interpretations. What is clear is that Paul's prohibitions of verse 12 are based on the circumstances of creation (vs 13-

14). By citing creation rather than some cultural circumstance, Paul bases his prohibitions against women teaching and exercising authority over men on the inherent differences between the sexes. Since these differences are permanent, we may rightly conclude that these prohibitions are just as permanent.

**I Tim** 3:1-13

This passage concerns itself with the qualifications for leadership in the household of God.

In verses 1 through 7 we are given the qualifications for "overseers" (episkopos). The same term is translated in older versions as "bishop." Both overseer and bishop are synonymous with "elder" (see Titus 1:5-7), and refer to the governing or ruling office of the church. In a previous verse, Paul issues a rule of order, "1 do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man" (I Tim 2:12); here as an outworking and application of the rule, he describes the qualification for overseers in masculine terms (i.e. "if any man aspires to the office" (I Tim 3:1); "the husband of one wife" (I Tim 3:2). That the office of elder should be filled exclusively by qualified men is appropriate, since their labors are designated in terms of teaching (I Tim 3:2; Titus 1:9) and of exercising authority over the church (Heb 13:17), the very same roles denied to women in I Tim 2:12.

In verses 8 through 13 we are given the qualifications for "deacons." The term literally means servant. When used in a technical sense, as it is here, it denotes an office devoted to ministries of service within the church. Verse 1 1 is especially significant, "women must likewise be dignified ...". This parenthetical statement is made in the middle of the discussion on deacons (vs 8-13), and it is difficult to determine whether the women spoken of here are (1) wives of the deacons or (2) women deacons; the word "gunaikas" can be translated either "women" or "wives."

The following reasons are given in support of each view:

1) Paul is speaking of women deacons:

a) Paul introduces the women mentioned here in the same fashion he introduced the men in I Tim 3:8, i.e., he uses the word "likewise." The "likewise" in 3:1 1 suggests that the qualifications for men who are deacons also apply to women deacons.

b) If Paul were speaking of wives of deacons, he could have made this very clear by adding a modifying pronoun "their" wives. By leaving it out, Paul implied that he was speaking of women in general, not just of deacons' wives.

c) The qualifications mentioned for women in 3:12 are identical with or similar to those required of deacons, and this suggests that an office is in view.

d) Further evidence that women functioned as deacons is found in the case of Phoebe. In Rom 16~,Paul says that she was "a deacon of the church of Cenchrece."

2) Paul is speaking of the wives of deacons:

a) The qualification "husband of one wife" (I Tim 3:12) would naturally exclude women.

b) Since the subject in verses 8-10 and 12-13 is male deacons, it would be unusual to switch the subject to female deacons in the middle of the discussion (v 1 1) without giving explicit indication such as, "the women who serve as deacons likewise ..."

c) A requirement for the wives of deacons would be appropriate in this context since Paul sees the status and conduct of a man's family as an essential qualification for church office.

d) The word "likewise" (v 1 1) does not necessarily prove that women were deacons, because Paul may be commending the wives to have the same virtues as male deacons without implying that they share the same office.

e) The lack of a modifying pronoun with "gunaikas" says nothing, since elsewhere in the New Testament modifiers are not used when it is clearly the case that the women or men being described are wives or husbands (i.e. Col 3:18-19, Eph 5:22-23).

f) The reference to Phoebe as a "diakonos" can be understood in a nontechnical, unofficial sense of "servant" rather than "deacon."

The practical resolution of the Deaconess issue is stated in the attached Policy Statement Section 3, "Women Deaconesses and Other Ministries Open to Women" (p. 18).

**I Cor. 11:2-16**

This passage is concerned with the proper manner in which men and women are to conduct themselves when praying and prophesying. Paul begins by stating the headship/submission principle, "Christ is the head (authority) of every man, and man is the head (authority) of the woman, and God is the head (authority) of Christ" (v 3).

Paul supports this absolute principle by enforcing a relative application; while praying and prophesying, men should leave their heads uncovered, and women should cover their heads. These gender specific rules of decorum emphasize male and female role distinctions and reflect a proper respect for authority within the divine and created order. The apostle goes on to defend the cultural practice of headcoverings by appealing to, among other things, the transcultural principles of God's creation design. The woman ought to have a "symbol of authority on her head" (v 10), because "she is the glory (honor) of man" (v 7), because "she originates from man" (v 8) and because "she was created for the man's sake" (v 9). In Paul's day, unlike today, "every woman who had her head uncovered while praying or prophesying disgraces her head" (v 5). Why? Because her actions would be interpreted as a rejection of God authorized male leadership and an attempt at blurring the distinction of the sexes. Paul's concern about

headcoverings is significant because of the message headcoverings conveyed to his culture. Paul's primary consideration is that Christians maintain the proper lines of authority while praying and prophesying. Both men and women should conduct themselves in a way becoming of who they are as male and female.

The practical application of the use of headcoverings is stated in the Appendix, p. 19.

**I Cor 14:33b-36**

This passage is concerned with proper order in the corporate assembly, with particular emphasis on the permissibility of women speaking. Paul begins with a rule of order, "Let the women keep silent in the churches; for they are not to speak" (v 34). Some interpret Paul's demand for silence as a response to some unique difficulty found among the Corinthians (i.e. certain women were unedu­cated, or disorderly, or teaching false doctrine). Yet this explanation is unlikely since the rule of silence was not unique to Corinth, but practiced in "all the churches of the saints" (vs 33b-34). This command for "women to keep silent" is preceded by a statement where Paul seems to imply that women can pray and prophesy (I Cor 11:5). Different approaches have been taken to reconcile these perplexing statements. The two we find most reasonable are as follows:

(1) The passages address the same type of speech -- women praying and prophesying, exercised in different settings. In one setting it is acceptable for women to speak and in the other it is not. Only I Cor 14 mentions the corporate assembly, where it is expressly forbidden for women to speak. Just as women gifted in teaching are not allowed to teach or exercise authority over a man, but "must remain silent," (I Tim 2:12), women are not to exercise authority by praying or prophesying in the corporate assembly where men are sure to be present, but must "keep silent" (I Cor 14:34).

On the other hand, in I Cor 11:1-16, praying and prophesying by women seem to be allowed, yet the exact setting is not specified. Paul may have hinted that praying and prophesying are acceptable if practiced by women in the absence of men. He states that women ought to have a symbol of authority on their heads "because of the angels" (I Cor 11:10). Why does Paul refer to angels when the man is the authority over the woman? Could it be because angels (who join in worship and desire to see God's creation order maintained) are the only ranking authorities present when women pray and prophesy among them­selves? The idea here is that Paul is restricting women from praying and prophesying in the corporate assembly, not in an assembly of other women.

(2) The passages address different types of speech, exercised in the same setting. Only the type of speech alluded to in I Cor 14 is restricted to men. The lack of rebuke, plus Paul's legislation of the practice in I Cor 11, give implicit approval to women praying and prophesying in the corporate assembly. Therefore, whatever "be silent" means in I Cor 14, it cannot include praying or prophesying. Furthermore, I Cor 14:34 cannot require total silence by women in the assembly because I Cor 14:23-26 describes occasions

when the "whole church" is assembled together and, in this context, "each one has a psalm, has a teaching, has a revelation, has a tongue, has an interpretation," seemingly implying that women as part of the whole also participate. Paul goes on to state in this same context that "all can prophesy" (v. 31), which presumably includes women.

What then does Paul mean when he commands that "women are to keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak" (v. 34)? In I Tim 2:12 women are told to be silent in respect to teaching and exercising authority over men. Paul may be implying the same meaning here. The verses that immediately precede (I Cor 14:29-33) deal with the careful weighing of oral prophecies, which is a governing function. The first time a man gave a prophecy and his wife, or any woman for that matter, passed judgment over it, the headship and submission relationship would be called into question. Therefore, when it comes to evaluation prophecies, which is an exercise of authority, Paul insists that women are to keep silent.

The practical application of women speaking in the worship assembly is stated in the Policy Statement Section 2, "Silence in the Worship Assembly", p. 17.

**B. We deny that the term *kephale* (head) in Ephesians 5:2-3 ("the husband is the head of the wife") and I Corinthians 1 1:3 ("the man is the head of woman") is best understood as "source" rather than as "authority over" which would weaken the idea of male headship in the home and church.**

A search of 2,236 examples of *kephale* from a wide range of ancient Greek literature produced no convincing examples where *kephale* meant source,l° The few alleged examples cited by proponents of the "source" view come from more than four hundred years before the time of the New Testament. The evidence to support the claim that *kephale* can mean "authority over," on the other hand, is substantial. All the major lexicons specializing in the New Testament period give this meaning, whereas none give the meaning "source." A search through biblical and extra-biblical literature yields at least 41 examples where *kephale* is used in the metaphorical sense to mean "authority over" thus establishing it as an accepted meaning at the time of the New Testament. Not only does lexical authority favor rendering "kephale" as "authority over", but exegetical analysis of one of the disputed texts implies this meaning. Paul asserts in Eph 5:22-23, "wives, submit to your husbands as to the Lord, for the husband is the head of the wife .... "When the headship of the husband is given as the basis for the submission of the wife, the most natural understanding is that head signifies some kind of leadership authority.

Article VI

**A. We affirm that the call to ministry in the Body of Christ extends to both men and women.**

With half the world's population outside the reach of indigenous evangelism; with countless other lost people both here and abroad who have heard the gospel but have yet to embrace it; with the stresses and miseries of sickness, malnutrition, homelessness, illiteracy, ignorance, aging, addiction, crime, incarceration, neuroses, and loneliness, no man or woman who feels a passion from God to make His grace known in word and deed need ever live without a fulfilling

ministry for the glory of Christ and the good of this Fallen world.

**B. We deny that a heartfelt sense of call to ministry should ever be used to set aside biblical criteria for particular ministries.**

We believe that God's distribution of skills, abilities, and talents is not gender-specific, nor are there spiritual gifts given to men that are withheld from women. Both men and women are encouraged to exercise their gifts within the parameters established by Scripture.

We are convinced that God will never call an individual to do or say anything which would contradict the truth He has left us in the Scripture. We again must remember that we are creatures redeemed from the Fall and for God. In Luther's phrase, we are at once simultaneously justified and sinners. Our hearts can deceive us and our only sure anchor is Scripture. Biblical teaching should remain the authority for testing our subjective discernment of God's will.

Article VII

**A. We affirm that neglect of these principles will lead to increasingly destructive consequences in our families, our churches and the culture at large.TM**

The trend toward eliminating role distinctions may cultivate a milieu of gender confusion that in the long run will lead to increasing destructive consequences. For example, sons who grow up in homes where the father gives no clear model of caring, strong, courteous leadership distinct from the role of the mother will find it much harder to develop their natural masculine identity in positive ways and will be likely candidates for the folly of macho distortions of manhood that ruin many homes. In the years to come, will it be enough to tell husbands and wives to love each other without helping them discover what is unique about manhood and womanhood in the dynamic of marriage? If all the emphasis is on gender neutrality and undifferentiated roles, how will sons learn the answer to the question, "What does it mean to grow up to be a man and not a woman?" And how will daughters learn to answer the question, "What does it mean to grow up to be a woman and not a man?" If these questions are regarded as anything less than utterly crucial, we think the resulting frustrations and confusions, through the loss of clear sexual identity in the generations to come, will lead to greater and more widespread hostilities and perversions among the sexes.

**B. We deny that earthly submission, whether domestic, religious, or civil ever implies a mandate to follow a human authority into sin.**

All human authorities, in the home, the church, or the state are subject to the teaching of God. All human authorities are also members of the Fallen human race and are still subject to the power of sin (even redeemed members for whom Christ died, Rom 7). All Christians have the responsibility to diligently study the Scriptures and pursue the Lord and ultimately follow Him alone. When our leaders clearly turn from the unmistakable teaching of Scripture, then it is our obligation to turn from these leaders and to the Lord. "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29).

[RESULTING] POLICY STATEMENT

**Summary of Principles:**

God created man and woman in His image (Gen 1:27). They are both justified by faith and possess equal standing and identical spiritual privilege before God (Gal 3:28). They were created male and female, forming a complementary relationship which implies certain distinctions (Gen 2:18-23). The man who was created first is to function as the head, and the woman created from the man for the man, functions as his helper (Gen 2:18-20; I Cor 11:3, 8-9). These role distinctions are historical and theological, not cultural and situational, and reflect God's design for the human race (I Cor 11:3, 8-9; I Tim 2:13-15). These role distinctions are recognized and maintained through the principle of male headship and female submission which is meant to operate in both the church (I Cor 11:2-16; I Cor 14:33-36; I Tim 2:8-15) and the home (Eph 5:22-6:9; Col 3:18 - 4:1; I Pet 2:13 - 3:7).

Our study has led us to formulate the following policy, in light of the principles stated above, to help clarify role distinctions between men and women in the home and here at Faith Evangelical Free Church:

**1) Teaching and Leadership**

We recognize the ambiguities involved in making distinctions between the kinds of roles and functions that are appropriate and inappropriate. Our expectation is not that we will arrive at exactly the same sense of where to draw the lines, but that we might come to affirm together the underlying principles. When Paul states in I Tim 2:12, "1 do not permit a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man," we do not understand him to mean an absolute prohibition of all teaching by women. As stated previously, older women are instructed to "teach what is good that they may train the young women to love their husbands and children" (I Titus 2:3,4), and mothers are commended for teaching their children (11 Tim 1:5; 3:14). Proverbs praises the ideal wife because "she speaks with wisdom and faithful instruction is on her tongue" (Prov 31:26). Neither do we understand Paul's prohibition to include every form of teaching directed at men. Priscilla, along with her husband Aquila, privately took Apollos aside and informally "explained to him the way of God more accurately" (Acts 18:26). And in Col 3:16 Paul instructs the body (presumably men and women) that they should "teach and admonish one another, with all wisdom, as you sing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs."

If Paul did not have every conceivable form of teaching in mind, what did he mean? It is our contention that Paul is using the word "teach" in the restricted sense of authoritative doctrinal instruction. This seems to be consistent with the way Paul uses the term throughout the pastoral epistles.TM Additionally, Paul intentionally links "teach" with "exercising authority over men." We **would say that the teaching inappropriate for a woman is any teaching of men that violate the headship/submission principle. Authoritative instruction (formal teaching that can be enforced with church discipline) is the primary responsibility of the elders and other qualified male leaders, when conducted in a mixed setting.**

I Tim 2:12 requires that those who govern all the people be men. This explicit directive is strengthened by the instruction for the choosing of elders in Titus 1 and the apostles in Acts 1, all of which envision only choosing men.

In summary, we understand Paul's prohibition concerning women "teaching" men to be

taken in the restrictive sense of authoritative doctrinal instruction and his prohibition against "exercising authority over men" to be understood in the absolute sense. It is our task to determine how these restrictions are worked out and applied.

Therefore, we have adopted certain guiding principles for evaluating what roles/functions are appropriate for men and women here at Faith Evangelical Free Church.

First, any individual, male or female, must be qualified to teach and/or lead. This qualification is based on the spiritual maturity of the potential teacher/leader, their adherence to the teaching of Scripture, and their desire to serve the church. Any individuals, male and female, may be disqualified from leadership if their disposition violates the spirit of male headship in the home and in the church.

Second, only men may occupy positions of leadership where 1) the role puts the leader in the position of functioning as the actual or *de facto* spiritual shepherd of a group that includes men (or an individual man), or 2) the role requires the kind of teaching that by its very nature calls for strong, forceful pressing of men's consciences aimed at converting the will on the basis of divine authority, or 3) where the role calls for the final determination of policies that establish overall spiritual direction for the church.

This would lead us to conclude that the following leadership positions would be restricted to men only: The roles of pastor, elder, and home group leader (when men are in the home group) would be limited to men because these positions all place the leader in the role of spiritual shepherd over men. Teaching positions in Adult Bible fellowships, Bible studies, Discipleship Training Seminars, Sunday School, and other mixed groups where adult males are present are primarily restricted to men. However, we recognize there are occasional times when a woman or a husband and wife team could be appropriate so long as the guiding principles of male headship are not violated, and the husband is the primary teacher; or the class concerns topics not binding on a man's conscience. Other leadership positions which strongly influence the spiritual direction or influence of the church are also restricted to men and would include Adult Bible Fellowship leader and chairs of some committees such as missions and worship.

Roles/functions which do not place the leader in the position of serving as spiritual shepherd, pressing men's consciences aimed at converting the will on the basis of divine authority, or providing overall spiritual direction to the church are open to all qualified men and women.

Certainly activities in which a group might be involved, such as participating in a group discussion on the meaning of a passage of Scripture or sharing the impact of the passage on their lives, which are neither teaching nor the exercise of authority, should include the full and free participation of the women in the group.

There is the question of when is it no longer appropriate for women to teach boys who are in transition to manhood. It seems best to answer this question in terms of when we as a society

define when a boy becomes a man.

Our culture has determined that a young person's eighteenth birthday is his or her right of passage into adulthood. (At 18 years of age a person is tried as an adult in a court of law, or can be drafted into the armed services.) It seems best to us to apply this same principle in the church. Invariably there will be situations in which a young man will turn eighteen before graduating out of the high school ministry. In these cases, the principle will be enforced upon graduation.

Finally, it should be acknowledged that the local church organization is flexible. Committee heads, such as missions committee chairman which currently is restricted to men, can change should the function of the position change. All roles and functions of leadership mentioned or unmentioned in the above paragraphs will be evaluated by the Elders on a case-by-case basis, using the above criteria.

**2) Silence in the Worship Assembly**

In attempting to reconcile Paul's command for "women to keep silent" in the corporate assembly (I Cor 14:34) with Paul's previous statement in which he implies that women can pray and prophesy (I Cor 11:5), we proposed several reasonable approaches to resolve the apparent conflict, each of which maintain the full authority of Scripture. Both proposals recognize Paul's rule for women to be silent in the corporate assembly. Silence, Paul asserts, properly expresses a woman's "submission" (I Cor 14:34). Most cultures, including the Jewish culture of this period, observed rules of propriety in speech. People were expected to speak in a manner appropriate to their position and relationship. Wives would usually speak in a way that expressed their submission to their husbands. The question to be answered is, "What kind of silence constituted proper submission?" Is it absolute silence, as advocated by the first approach? Or is it a qualified silence (i.e. judging prophecies) as advocated by the second?

Though Paul's instructions may have been clear to the Corinthians, they are no longer perfectly clear to us. Therefore, faced with the possibility of restricting "all speech" or "certain kinds of speech," we have opted to enforce the less restricted option. We choose to not bind others' consciences where we are not certain of our Scriptural warrant. We are convinced that Paul is restricting at **least some kinds of speech, which we have interpreted to be speaking in ways and settings that would dishonor the calling of men to bear the responsibility for teaching and leadership in the assembly. (This would not preclude women in the assembly from giving announcements, missions reports, praying, or sharing the impact of God in their lives.)**

3) Women Deaconesses and Other Ministries Open to Women

We cannot establish from Scripture with certainty whether the office of deacon was open to women from the early inception of the church. Or did the official role of deaconess evolve later? What is evident is that women were actively involved in ministry from the very beginning. Priscilla is named as a co-worker with Paul (Rom 16:3); Mary is said to have labored much (Rom 16:6); elsewhere Paul commends Euodia and Syntyche for helping in the cause of the gospel (Phil 4:3). It was the pattern of service in the early church that whenever a position for a man existed, there also existed some complementary position for a woman. The women served under the men and were primarily concerned with the care of other women and children.

Though the official office of deaconess may not be clearly prescribed in Scripture, it most certainly is not prohibited, so long as the office concerns itself with the care and shepherding of women and children under the authority of male leadership.

We, the Elders of Faith Evangelical Free Church, acknowledge that the positions taken in this statement are counter to current societal trends. Yet it is our conviction that they are rooted in Holy Scripture. We believe that the greatest satisfaction and fulfillment comes to those who honor and respect gender differences and attempt to reach their potential within the parameters of God's design, accepting by faith that the God who made us male and female knows how we function best. We also admit that we are "but dust." Our best efforts **may** still fall short of the true heart of God. We therefore offer this paper in humility, believing that we have hit the mark, yet trusting in His grace when we have not.

**Appendix I - The Use of Headcoverings**

The fundamental principle discussed in I Cor 1 1 is the distinction between men and women that God has designed from creation and the difference it makes in how they function as male and female. The crucial point is that men and women continue to follow their God-appointed roles. Paul instructed the Corinthian women to wear a headcovering to indicate (in the sight of men and angels) that they were submitted to the male leadership. This was simply a relative application (headcoverings) of an absolute principle (headship). The non-use of a headcovering, though significant in Paul's days, sends absolutely no message at all in our culture. The message of our culture is that no distinction should be made between the roles of men and women -- something that is clearly in opposition to Paul's teaching. And unfortunately we have no culturally equivalent symbol to acknowledge our acceptance of God's order.

Therefore, in a stand against the ungodly tendencies of our culture, men and women should dress in such a way as to celebrate their masculinity and femininity. Perhaps Christian women should visibly demonstrate their submission to God's ordained order by wearing a headcovering or some culturally relevant symbol of authority when they pray in the assembly. Nevertheless, the necessity for headcoverings (or what constitutes a proper head covering) is not perfectly clear. It is very possible that Paul was condemning the rebellion associated with the removal of the headcovering in a culture where the pre-existing practice had a well-known and accepted meaning. This does not necessarily imply that Paul is insisting that the practice of headcoverings should be introduced into a culture like ours where it has absolutely no established meaning.

Therefore, since it is not wise to bind others consciences when we are not certain of our Scriptural foundation. Each person in the congregation is free to act according to the dictates of his or her own conscience in this matter.

**NOTES**

1. Raymond C. Ortlund, Jr., "Male-female Equality and Male Headship", in Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem, (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1991) p 97.

2. George W. Knight III, The New Testament Teaching on the Role Relationship of Men and Women, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1977) p 20

3. Adapted from a statement of ordination of women from a committee at Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Debbie Henderson, Chairperson, January 1989, "Trinitarian Analogy", p 13.

4. Raymond C. Ortlund, Jr., "Male-female Equality and Male Headship", p 109.

5. Taken from a statement of ordination of women from a committee at Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Debbie Henderson chairperson, p 15.

6. The explanation for this denial taken from Stephen B. Clark, Man and Woman In Christ, (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1980) pp 215-219.

7. Editor's endnote to chapter eight, Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, pp 493-494.

8. See particularly George W. Knight III, "Authenteoeo in Reference to Women in I Tim 2:12", New Testament Studies 30 (1984): pp143-157, and Leland Edward Wilshire, "The Thesaurus Linguae Graecae and Further Reference to Authenteo in I Tim 2:12", New Testament Studies 34 (1988): pp120-134.

9. Thomas R. Schreiner, "The Ministries of Women in the Context of Male Leadership", in Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, pp213-214 and endnote 13, p 505.

10. Wayne Gruden, "The Meaning of Kephale, A Response to Recent Studies", Appendix 1 in Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, pp 425-468.

11. Both Article VII A and the commentary which follows were taken from John Piper and Wayne Grudem, "Charity, Clarity and Hope", Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, p 415.

12. Robert L. Saucey, "Women's Prohibition to Teach Men: An Investigation Into Its Meaning and Contemporary Application", Jets 37/1 (March 1994) pp 79-97.

**CBE “STATEMENT OF FAITH”\***

**(See website for more articles)**

We believe the Bible is the inspired word of God, is reliable, and is the final authority for faith and practice.

We believe in the unity and trinity of God, eternally existing as three equal persons.

We believe in the full deity and full humanity of Jesus Christ.

We believe in the sinfulness of all persons. One result of sin is shattered relationships with God, others, and self.

We believe that eternal salvation and restored relationships are possible through faith in Jesus Christ who died for us, rose from the dead, and is coming again. This salvation is offered to all people.

We believe in the work of the Holy Spirit in salvation, and in the power and presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of believers.

We believe in the equality and essential dignity of men and women of all ethnicities, ages, and classes. We recognize that all persons are made in the image of God and are to reflect that image in the community of believers, in the home, and in society.

We believe that men and women are to diligently develop and use their God-given gifts for the good of the home, church, and society.

We believe in the family, celibate singleness, and faithful heterosexual marriage as God's design.

We believe that, as mandated by the Bible, men and women are to oppose injustice.

\*I could not locate a document that “answers” the Danvers Statement. Unpacking this statement would mostly do this. The CBE website has plenty of specific articles to use to do this. The length of the Danver’s statement is because they created an “apologetic” for their view in the statement. Length in not in itself proof!

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* **END OF INSERTS \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***
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IV. Paul’s Response to a Written communiqué from Corinth (7:1-16:4; cf. 7:1)
 A. Paul’s response to issues of sex and marriage (7:1-40)
 B. Paul's response to the question of food sacrificed to idols (8:1-11:1)

**C. Paul's Response to the questions of Public Worship (11:2-34)**1. Male and Female in Worship before God (11:2-16)
**2. The community of believers in Worship before God (11:17-34)**

“In 11:17-32 ‘the strong’ or wealthy turn the Lord’s Supper into a festival meal in the course of which socially deprived or economically dependent late comers are treated as hangers-on who may have to eat different fare in a different part of the house, thereby undermining the ‘for others’ of the cross itself which the Lord’s Supper proclaims (11:26).” (Garland, 799)

“…to argue that the behavior of some of the Corinthians can be accounted for, because at the Lord’s Dinner they followed the socially accepted convention of ‘private’ dinners in secular Corinth.” (Winter, *After*, 142)

 1a. The **problem** of the Lord's Supper in the Corinthian assembly (11:17-22)

This section begins with perhaps Paul’s most blunt censure, 11:17, “In the following directive I have no praise for you, for your meetings do more ham than good.” (NIV2011) It does not appear that Paul is responding to a Corinthian question from 7:1 but that he is addressing an urgent public-worship issue about which he has learned.

Consider some of the “red flags” in 11:17-22 concerning previously learned problems:

* “…there are divisions among you…” (11:18)
* Status conflict (11:19)
* The nature of the gathering follows Roman status and meal protocol (11:20-21, see especially Winter, *After*, 142ff.). Garland sites Pliny the Younger’s description of such events: “The best dishes were set in front of himself [the host] and a select few, and cheap scraps of food before the rest of the company. He had even put the wine into very small flasks, divided into three catefories…one for himself and us, another for his lesser friends (all his friends are graded) and the third for his and our freed persons.” (Pliny, Letters, 2.6; Garland, 861, note 46).
* Paul denies them the claim that it is the “Lord’s Supper” (11:20-21). Note that Winter consistently refers to this section as the “Lord’s Dinner,” perhaps punning on its illegitimate nature of the event (although the Greek term is the standard term for “supper” and such meals).
* The dinner becomes the typical drunken setting of the status-banquets and totally marginalizes the non-status believers both in food, drink and presence! (11:20-22)
* Paul upbraids this behavior in no uncertain terms (11:22, note the balance of 11:17 and 22, NO PRAISE, PERIOD!)

2a. The **proper tradition** concerning the Lord's Supper (11:23-34)

After Paul slams the worldly dinner setting in 11:17-22, he rehearses the Dominical tradition of the Lord’s Supper.

1b. The historical institution of the Lord's Supper (11:23-26)

The terms translated “received” and “delivered” in 11:23 are **technical terms for the “authoritative transmission of tradition,”** especially the term “delivered” (the verb for παράδoσις, "traditions"). Note how Paul “plays” on this term in 23a, Paul hands, and 23b, Jesus was handed over (Hays, 198).

**Define “ordinance”** (some say sacrament):

An ordinance is 1/ A practice instituted by Jesus; 2/ And a practice commanded by Jesus to be perpetuated; and 3/ And a practice actually perpetuated by the Apostles in the Early Church.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Matthew 26Matt. 26:26   While they were eating, **Jesus took a loaf of bread**, and after blessing it he broke it, gave it to the disciples, and said, “Take, eat; this is my body.” 27 Then **he took a cup, and after giving thanks he gave it to them, saying, “Drink from it, all of you;** 28 for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins. 29 I tell you, I will never again drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom.”  | Mark 14Mark 14:22   While they were eating, **he took a loaf of bread**, and after blessing it he broke it, gave it to them, and said, “Take; this is my body.” 23 Then **he took a cup, and after giving thanks he gave it to them, and all of them drank from it.** 24 He said to them, “This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many. 25 Truly I tell you, I will never again drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.” | Luke 22Luke 22:14   When the hour came, he took his place at the table, and the apostles with him. 15 He said to them, “I have eagerly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; 16 for I tell you, I will not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.” 17 Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he said, “Take this and divide it among yourselves; 18 for I tell you that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes.” 19 Then **he took a loaf of bread,** and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them, saying, “This is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.” 20 And **he did the same with the cup after supper,** saying, “This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood. | 1 Cor 111Cor. 11:23   For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed **took a loaf of bread**, 24 and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, “This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.” 25 **In the same way he took the cup also, after supper**, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.” 26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.  |

In Paul’s rehearsal of the Lord’s Supper, Winter observes that “Paul has changed the word order of the institution narrative…” (*After*, 153, requires Greek analysis). Winter proposes that Paul is sending a message. The personal pronoun “of me/my/mine” is moved forward. Winter argues that this would be an unusual change given the Dominical tradition consistency and therefore is sending a message (read him in location for details).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Matthew 26:26τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.  | Mark 14:22τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. | Luke 22:19τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑpὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· | 1 Cor 11:24τοῦτό **μού** ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑpὲρ ὑμῶν |

“It becomes clear that Paul’s purpose in quoting the Eucharistic words was not simply to repeat a tradition that he had already delivered to them but to explain why that tradition did not endorse their conduct but condemned it—‘For I received from the Lord…’ (11:23). By rearranging the word order of parts of that tradition he explicated the significance of Jesus’ action as a servant giving himself up on their behalf to incorporate them into the New Covenant. His action thoroughly condemned their own self-centered conduct exhibited at the very dinner which Jesus instituted for them to remember his death. Little wonder that Paul declares that this cannot be the Lord’s Dinner (11:20), for that imposed the obligation to imitate Christ in their relationships (cf. 11:1).” (154)

Attendant question to the event of Jesus’ initiating “the Supper” in the Gospels, “Did Jesus actually eat the Passover meal?” (cf. Lk 22:15-16) This issue relates to the Chronology of Passion Week. You can surface plenty of literature to address this question. See Garland, 871ff. as well as other sources.

2b. Paul’s pronouncement of judgment on a community that abuses the Lord’s Supper (11:27-34)

* The pronouncement (11:27) [NOTE the adverb]
* The expectation of self-examination at the taking of the Lord’s Supper (11:28)
* The consequences of the failure to self-examine (11:29-32)
* The immediate resolution to the problem until Paul returns (11:33-34)

\* \* \* \* \* \*

The proper practice of the Lord's Supper in the assembly (11:27-34)

1c. Framing the Lord’s Supper within the Jewish Passover history:

 **Exodus 12-13**: Observance in family context (12:1-6)
 Pre-selected lamb slaughtered at twilight on eve of Passover (12:1-6)
 Lamb’s blood ritually applied on door frame (12:7)
 A meal with unleavened bread and bitter herbs (12:8-11)
 Head of family rehearses religious tradition during the meal (13:25-27)
 Package in the seven day Festival of Unleavened Bread that
 required a pilgrimage to a holy site on the seventh
 day (13:6)

**Deut 16:1-8** (cf. 2 Chron 30; 35:1-19) reflects a move of Passover celebration from the family unit to a national context. This brings about some changes.

 From the home to a national pilgrimage festival (national needs)
 Animal may be either sheep or cattle (Deut 16:2; cf. Exod 12:3)
 Time of sacrifice changed (Deut 16:6; cf. Exod 12:6), probably for the convenience of the pilgrims! From roasting to boiling (Deut 16:7; cf. Exod 12:9)
 Two Second Temple sources on the Passover practice :
 **Jubilees 49** (150 BCE)
 ***Mishnah Pesahim*** (about 200 CE)

2c. **Matthew 26:17-46** (cf. Mark 14:1-52; Luke 22:1-53; John 13:1-38) provides a base to
 understand the historical setting and sequence in which the “Lord’s Supper” was
 instituted.

The variations between the Synoptic and Johannine traditions is probably due to (1) the use of various calendars between religious groups, or (2) to the writers’ thematic interest, or (3) to Jesus rescheduling the event for framing purposes. We will assume that Jesus did indeed eat the Passover meal with his disciples the night before he was crucified.

 **The Preparation (26:17-19)** The **occasion** (17): Feast of Unleavened Bread/Passover (cf. Exod 12)
 The **instructions** (18-19): “My time is at hand”
 Reveals that Christ came to fulfill God’s will.
 Christ’s omniscience (Mk 14:13)
 Messianic self-consciousness (cf. Jn 7:6,8)

 **The Purging (26:20-25; 31-35)**

 The **disclosure** of the betrayer (20-25; cf. 26:14-16)

 All twelve were present (21)
 Jesus informs them that he will be betrayed (22)
 Note: Disciples are not defensive…sign of maturing.
 Jesus’ focus on Judas (23-25)
 Incident at Bethany (26:1-16; cf. Jn 12:4-6)
 Upper Room confrontation
 Washes Judas’ feet (Jn 13:1-20)
 Gives Judas the place of honor (Jn 13:26)
 Judas’ departure (26:26 with Jn 13:30)

 The **predictions** (31-35)
 Their scattering (31; cf. Zech 13:7)
 His resurrection (32)
 Peter’s denial (33-35; 26:69-75)

 **The Partaking (26:26-30)**

 The institution of the “supper” (26-29)
 Symbolism
 Prophetic promise
 The farewell message in the upper room (Jn 14)
 The hymn and departure (30)
 The Hallel Psalms were sung during Passover (Pss 113-118)
 Read Ps 118 in light of the Lord’s Supper (probably the last
 Psalm sung by those in the Upper Room. Cf. Matt 26:30)
 Departure to Gethsemane (Jn 15-17 delivered just before walking
 out or on the way)

 **The Prayer (26:36-46)** The “cup” and the disciples

 \* \* \* \* \* \* \* EXCURSUS…SERMON \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

Good Friday Sermon Gary T. Meadors, Th.D.

 Grand Rapids Theo Sem

**INTRODUCTION**

Today is **“Good Friday.”** When we understand what this last 24 hours in the earthly life of Jesus contained, it seems like calling it “Good Friday” is an oxymoron. What is “good” about it? Anger, jealousy, hatred and cowardice seem to triumph over reason and justice. What is “good” about such things? What is “good” about the physical torture and death of an innocent man? Whatever one’s opinion about how Mel Gibson’s “The Passion of the Christ” images this day, this was, in the annals of history, a very ugly day.

Yet, in the plan of God, it was a “good” day. The last song sung at the last supper late the night before was probably the last in a series of Hallel Psalms used at the Passover celebration. Psalm 118 would still be ringing in Jesus’ ear those last few hours. Perhaps the words of this Psalm were part of his struggle in prayer in Gethsemane. Listen to some of the words of Psalm 118.

 1 Oh, give thanks unto the Lord, for he is **good**;
 because his mercy endureth forever. (KJV)

 5 In my anguish I cried to the LORD,
 and he answered by setting me free.
 6 The LORD is with me; I will not be afraid.
 What can man do to me?
 7 The LORD is with me; he is my helper.
 I will look in triumph on my enemies. (NIV)
 8 It is better to take refuge in the LORD
 than to trust in man. (middle verse of the whole bible in Eng!)

 22 The stone which the builders refused
 has become the head of the corner.
 23 This is the LORD’S doing;
 It is marvelous in our eyes.
 24 This is the day which the LORD has made;
 We will rejoice and be glad in it.

 29 Oh, give thanks unto the LORD, for he is **good**;
 for his mercy endureth forever.

In spite of the horrific circumstances and evil deeds of all present on that day of suffering and crucifixion, **it was a “good day.”**

For Jesus, as unique Son of Man and Servant of the Lord, it was a day of exaltation and humiliation. For we human observers, we might want to emphasize the humiliation aspect and leave the exaltation to resurrection Sunday. But that would not be God’s view of these events. The death of Jesus was a victory in the plan of God.

For our reflections this “Good Friday,” please turn to **Isaiah 52:13-53:11**, and **stand** for the reading of God’s Word. While I appreciate and use many different Bible versions, I am choosing to read from the King James today because of a certain dignity in its speech, although I may help it a bit!

 **READ the text….**

 **EXPLAIN the text….**

**I. THE SETTING OF THIS SERVANT “SONG”**

 The Book of Isaiah is built around three Messianic Portraits:
 The King (1-37)
 The Servant (38-55)
 The Anointed Conqueror (56-66)

 Isaiah 52-53 is the fourth and last in a series of Servant Songs in Isaiah (cf. Motyer, in.loc. for this entire analysis).

* It delineates the completion of the work of the Servant;
* This work is imaged as the “wounding and bruising of one who bore the sins of others”;
* It is followed by viewing the results of this sin-bearing, substitutionary service as

 something to “sing” (54:1, first word!) about;
 achieving “peace” with God (54:10; cf. Rom 5:1);
 establishing the people in righteousness (53:11; 54:17);
 calling a sinful world to repentance (55:6-7);
 and a pilgrimage with God (55:12).

 It is a **“good day”** afterall !

**II. THE STRUCTURE, AND THEREFORE MESSAGE, OF THE SERVANT “SONG”**

The Bible, as well as being God’s Word, is a highly crafted piece of literature. How could anything less really honor the great God of all creation? This Servant Song in Isaiah 52:13-53:12 reflects thoughtful organization for the greatest impact on the hearer (still dependent on Motyer). The text is laid out in a literary form known as “chiasm”:

 A1 **The ENIGMA**: exaltation and humiliation (52:13-15)

 B **A REVELATION** about the Servant’s suffering and death
 (53:1-9)

 A2 **The SOLUTION OF THE ENIGMA**: exaltation through the humiliation of sin-bearing suffering (53:10-12)

Let us think through this text and its three movements:

 **A. THE ENIGMA OF THE SERVANT (52:13-15)**

 1. The exaltation of the Servant (13)
 2. The humiliation of the exalted BUT suffering Servant (14)
 3. The subjugation of the world to this enigma (15; cf. 1 Cor 2:6-16)

 **B. THE REVELATION ABOUT THE SERVANT (53:1-9)**

 1. Revelation, not human wisdom, brings the suffering Servant into focus (53:1-3; cf. 1 Cor 1-2 again).

 2. Revelation explains the Servant’s suffering as vicarious…he
 suffered alone and suffered for others not himself (53:4-6).

 3. Revelation declares that the suffering Servant must DIE in order

 achieve his work on behalf of others (53:7-9).

 **C. THE SOLUTION TO THE ENIGMA IS THAT DEATH ACHIEVES EXALTATION (53:10-12).**

 1. The Servant’s death is OUR sin-offering (10)

 2. God the Father affirms the Servant’s offering as the basis to justify the “others” for whom the Servant has died (11-12)

**So, we have the message of the Suffering Servant wonderfully contained in the structure of Isaiah 52:13-53:12. But now lets hear the …**

**III. THE “REST OF THE STORY!”**

As you listen to this story of the Suffering Servant who died for our sins, you might wonder why an Old Testament text doesn’t convince Jewish persons that Jesus is indeed THE Messiah. The answer in one sense, is simple. They view the Suffering Servant as the nation of Israel, not as an individual who bore the sin of the world. Indeed, history has provided much suffering to God’s ethnic people, the Jews.

A rather out spoken first century Jew, however, did get the point of Isaiah. Peter, in his first epistle, chapter 2, verses 21-25 (1 Peter 2:21-25), contains the most extensive reflection (in citation and allusions) of Isaiah 53 in the New Testament. Listen to these words:

 **READ 1 Peter 2:21-25**

**CONCLUSIONS**

As we bring out reflections to a close, I just want to read an old hymn for you…yes, a hymn, now you really know I’m just an antique (that’s sarcasm if you didn’t get it!).

 What will you do with Jesus? Neutral you cannot be.
 For someday you will be asking, What will he do with me?!

.

IV. Paul’s Response to a Written communiqué from Corinth (7:1-16:4; cf. 7:1)
 A. Paul’s response to issues of sex and marriage (7:1-40)
 B. Paul's response to the question of food sacrificed to idols (8:1-11:1)
 C. Paul's Response to the questions of Public Worship (11:2-34)

**D. Paul's Response to the Questions Concerning Spiritual Gifts (12:1-14:40).**

Section Summary: Paul discusses spiritual "gifts" from two perspectives: The sovereign Lord and the law of Love. The one gift that seems to have been creating problems in Corinth was tongues. Yet, Paul argues that tongues, instead of being the ultimate test of spirituality, are actually one of the least desirable gifts. Besides being placed last in gift lists (12:10; 12:29-30), the whole argument of 12:1-14:40 is that edification and love are the supreme demonstrations of spirituality, not tongues. In fact, tongues were actually being a hindrance to both edification and love. "By comparison [with more overt gifts] the practice of Christian virtue seemed staid and colourless. Paul's discussion of this subject is epoch-making. He begins by showing that it is the Lordship of Christ that is important" (Morris, p. 165).

Richard Hays sees the threefold structure of 1 Cor 12-14 as:

* Chapter 12 argues the complementary role of gifts in the community. There are not individualistic privatized items.
* Chapter 13 presents love as the norm governing all spiritual manifestations.
* Chapter 14 provides some guidelines to govern gifts, especially tongues, that now emerges as the presenting problem.

Other structural observations:

 **12:1-3 “Jesus is Lord”** 12:4-30 Unity in Diversity
 12:31-13:13 Primacy of Love
 14:1-36 Order in Gifts
 **14:37-40 Teaching “is Lord”**

 **1. Spiritual Gifts and the Sovereign Lord (12:1-31).**

1 Cor 12-14 is flagged by the “now concerning” (περὶ δὲ) that introduces a new section/question. This time, Paul does not provide an original question or slogan but seems to respond to a general misunderstanding about the subject of “gifts.”

We begin our analysis with some general observations about “spiritual gifts” in the New Testament.

**What is a gift?**

* The term "gift" does not clearly communicate the concept of 1 Cor 12:1-14:40.

 Two Greek terms are prominent in these chapters: πvευματικo/ς and χάρισμα. The term **pneumatikos** is an adjective which means "spiritual." It may refer to a person (1 Cor 2:15; 3:1; 14:37-38; Gal 6:1), a thing (such as the resurrection body, 1 Cor 15) or to the domain of the Spirit (that which pertains to the Spirit, e.g. what is often tagged in translations as a "gift"). In 1 Cor 12-14, *the term "gift" is supplied* with pneumatikos (e.g. 12:1 literally = "now about the spirituals"—but since it can be masculine or neuter, it could be “spiritual things/gifts” or “spiritual persons [who are gifted].” It could well be masculine in light of 12:2-3 which addresses people).

 The term **charisma** is a neuter noun derived from the root which signifies "grace." In the spiritual domain, it signifies a special manifestation of the divine presence, activity, power, and/or grace.

 These two terms are combined in Romans 1:11, “…For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift (μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν πνευματικὸν), to the end ye may be established;” (ASV). With the adj/noun, literally = “spiritual charisma”

The normal Greek term for gift, δῶρον, does not occur in the gift lists. While the above terms are almost universally translated as "gift", **this English translation conjures up in the mind of a non-critical reader an array of ideas which may or may not be the intent of the text.**

* **Definition**

 The definition of a "spiritual gift" in the context of 1 Cor 12-14 is a careful reading of 1 Cor 12:7: "Now to each one *the manifestation of the Spirit is given for the common good*." Definitions include:

* “an ability or ministry which the Spirit actualizes within the believers and which reveals the presence of the Spirit” [subjective genitive] (Ciampa, 571)
* “…the question is: Is the genitive *pneumatos* to be taken here as objective, i.e., that the gift manifest the Spirit (to others in the community); or as subjective, i.e., what the Spirit manifests in the gift given? Either sense would suit the context.” (Fitzmyer, 466).
* the genitive “is much more probably objective (the operation which manifests the Spirit in public). Thus the animating power and purpose is *one*, even if phenomena in the public domain take diverse forms.” (Thiselton, 936). Thiselton translates the verse as: “To each is given the public manifestation of the Spirit for common advantage.” (928)
* The **nature of “spiritual language”** should also be considered. When under the “umbrella” of the Church in which the Spirit empowers, every activity that enhances the community for spiritual purposes is credited to the Spirit in religious language,

even though at times, the talent/gift may well be the product of a human being’s journey in life (e.g. musician, accountant, speaker, comforter, etc.). To serve with your abilities under the Church umbrella is to exercise your giftedness for spiritual purposes.

**Gifted persons percolate to the surface *in the midst of ministry* as a result of the inward work of the Spirit and for the resulting imaging of a “spiritual” community.**

* **An Overview of “Spiritual Gifts” in the New Testament**

**1. The terms used by the NT**

* The word “gift” as we understand gift in our language is never used in Greek but is supplied by translators for the following constructs.
* The Greek designations in “gift” texts break out as follows.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Adjective *pneumatikos*“spiritual” | Noun *charisma*“something graciously given” | Terms occur together |
| “spiritual [gifts]” (1 Cor 12:1; 14:1)Mostly ***functions*** as an adjective, e.g. “spiritual body, food, songs, blessings” etcetera.Four times it refers to believers as “spiritual” and every reference views spirituality as correlation with God’s Word (1 Cor. 2:15; 3:1; 14:37; Gal. 6:1; See BDAG Lexicon). | Salvation (Rom. 5:15)Blessings, privilege (Rom. 11:29)Celibacy (1 Cor. 7:7)Money (2 Cor 1:11)[Spiritual] “gifts” (Rom. 12:6; 1 Cor. 1:7; 12:4, 9, 28, 30; 1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6; 1 Peter 4:10) | “spiritual gift” (Rom 1:11) |

In light of the above, so-called spiritual gifts are believers who demonstrate **“graciously energized functions within the Body that characterize the Spirit’s management of spiritual/church activities for the benefit of the Body.”** (gtm)

**2. The lists of “gifts” in the NT. There are only 4 lists!** (NRSV translation)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1 Corinthians 12:8-10**Utterance of wisdomUtterance of knowledge Faith Healing Working of Miracles Prophecy Discernment of spiritsVarious kinds of tonguesInterpretation of tongues**Note the way the list is designed!** | **1 Corinthians 12:28**ApostlesProphetsTeachersWork miraclesGifts of HealingForms of Assistance [helping]Forms of Leadership [Administration]Speak in tonguesInterpret [tongues](“But strive for the greater gifts, and I will show you a still more excellent way.” … love… 12:31) |
| **Romans 12:6-8**Prophecy in proportion to faithMinistry in ministeringThe teacher in teachingThe exhorter in exhortationThe giver in generosityThe leader in diligenceThe compassionate in cheerfulness | **Ephesians 4:11** (people/offices that perform functions) **\*\*SEE NOTE BELOW**ApostlesProphetsEvangelistsPastorsTeachers(CONTEXT = “to equip the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ, until all of us come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to maturity,… We must no longer be children, tossed to and fro and blown about by every wind of doctrine….” 4:12-14) |
| **Non-list references**Rom. 1:11 “…that I may share with you some spiritual gift to strengthen you—“Rom. 11:29 refers to Israel’s privilege, not the current category of gifts.1 Cor. 1:7 “…so that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift”2 Cor. 1:11 KJV renders as gift but should be “blessing, favor”1 Tim. 4:14 Timothy, “do not neglect the gift that is in you….”2 Tim. 1:6 Timothy, “…rekindle the gift that is within you….”1 Peter 4:10 “Like good stewards… serve one another with whatever gift each of you has received. |

\*\* Notes on Context of Ephesians 4

* Eph 4:1 begins the “application”/ethical section of the epistle.
* Eph 4:1-16 is a call “to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (4:3).
* Eph 4:1-6 is the basis/**grounds of unity**: The **Trinity** is the model for unity.
* Eph 4:7-16 asserts that God’s **gifting of individuals to equip the church** for its work in the world **is the means to achieve unity**. See especially 4:12.
	+ We are all gifted to fulfill a task in the Church by our connection to Christ (4:7)
	+ Paul validates gifting by an analogical proof-text use of Psalm 68 with a Christological twist. The ascending and descending refers to Christ’s incarnation and ascension.
* **Eph 4:11-16** focuses on **a group of gifted persons who are responsible to equip believers to do the work of ministry.** The church is not an evangelistic hall; it is an equipping center. You come in and get equipped; you go out and evangelize then bring them in to get equipped.

**A philosophy of “lists” in the Bible:**

* Any given list is seldom complete.
* Any given list I designed to serve a purpose within its own context.
* Consequently, all lists of the same subject should be compared.
* The sum total of all lists of the same subject does not necessarily mean you have a complete list.
* What would you add to a list of “spiritual gifts” for your church in your own cultural contexts? (e.g. Sunday School Superintendent; Ushers; Youth Leader; Musicians and Music/Worship Leaders….)

**3. Observations in light of the above data**

 1a. **“Gifts” are functions to fulfill and enhance the activities of the Church.** The functions are under the umbrella of Church and the Church is orchestrated by the Spirit consequently they are imaged in relation to the work of the Spirit.

 2a. Some gifts are miraculous and therefore a direct endowment from God; Some gifts are “ordinary” functions of persons who emerge as, for example, “gifted” to encourage others. In this regard, **the skills and character of a person before becoming a Christian may also serve God and community in this new, spiritual, context and thereby be called a “spiritual gift.”**

 3a. Deciding the role of the miraculous kinds of gifts in the current Church is highly debated.

 See Wayne Grudem, editor, *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?* (Counterpoints
 series. Zondervan).

 4a. **All lists are contextually conditioned and therefore no one list or even the**

 **total of lists is necessarily complete. Consequently, the Church continues to
 expand what constitutes a “gift” on the basis of changed cultural conditions
 and the needs of the Body.**

 5a. **How does the Church identify the gifts of its members?**

 1b. **By critical thinking** about what your ministry context needs.

 2b. **By observation** of how members function as they worship and work within the Body. *You do not declare your gift the body affirms it.*

 3b. **By recognizing** God ordained leadership (Eph 4:11). Again, according to 1 Timothy 3, *you do not tell the Church what office you want to hold, they tell you what office you are qualified to hold.*

 The private and independent mindset of *American* Christianity has abused the issue of gifts. We think that gifting is *our* decision, but it is not. It is God’s will and the Church’s recognition within ministry context.

 1 Timothy 3 …you can desire but the Church appoints by evaluation.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* END OF OPENING REMARKS \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

**D. Paul's Response to the Questions Concerning Spiritual Gifts (12:1-14:40).**

 **1. Spiritual Gifts and the Sovereign Lord (12:1-31).**

 **1a. The function of the Spirit is to enable the believer to recognize Jesus as Lord (12:1-3).**

 1b. The section marker and subject signal (“now concerning” / peri\ de\ (12:1)

It is not self-evident to what τῶν πνευματικῶν refers. Is it a reference to people who are spiritual (cf. 2:15; 3:1; 14:37; held by Hurd, Garland and Bruce), or is it a reference to the "gifts" (cf. 14:1). Fee suggests that this terminology is used for gifts in order to place gifts in the perspective of endowments given by the Spirit, i.e. "the things of the Spirit".

Consider the force of “I do not desire you to be ignorant” (οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν) in 12:1 with “if anyone is ignorant, let him be ignorant” (εἰ δέ τις ἀγνοεῖ, ἀγνοεῖται) in 14:38. The fact that these are the terminal texts makes this juxtaposition of ἀγνοέω even more pronounced.

 2b. Paul’s rehearsal of the Corinthian’s previous life (Οἴδατε ὅτι … 12:2; cf. “do you not know” in earlier sections)

Paul uses phrases with oἴδατε/know as a rhetorical form of reminder.

Paul's reference to idols is not immediately apparent to the 20th century reader. It seems probable, however, that Paul is reminding the readers that "inspired" utterances were also the phenomena of paganism and that the real test of glossolalia was submission to the lordship of Christ, a submission which would also produce obedience to apostolic teaching (cf. 14:37-38).

F. F. Bruce reminds us that "in classical literature, Apollo was particularly renowned as the source of ecstatic utterances, as on the lips of Cassandra of Troy, the priestess of Delphi, or the Sibyl of Cumae (whose frenzy as she prophesied under the god's control is vividly described by Virgil); at a humbler level the fortune-telling slave-girl of Ac. 16:16 was dominated by the same kind of 'pythonic' spirit" (NCB, p. 117).

“however you were led” clause--Barrett observes: "It suggests moments of ecstasy experienced in heathen religion, when a human being is (or is believed to be) possessed by a supernatural; for example, in Lucian's *Dialogi Mortuorum* xix.1, Paris, speaking of the power of love, says, A sort of god (δαίμωv) carries us away (ἄγει) wherever he wills, and it is impossible to resist him" (278-279).

 3b. Paul’s authoritative instruction about true spirituality (διὸ γνωρίζω ὑμῖν ὅτι 12:3)

About 27 “curse tablets” with “curse” inscriptions have been found in Corinth. This polytheistic culture used “curse formula” to “influence” sports, love, politics/rivalries, and commerce (Winter, *After*, 164-165). Winter argues that the evidence of the use of curses in Roman Corinth may have been carried into some Christian practice as well. The “gods” held powerful sway over the populace and the populace saw their gods as a way to manipulate their world.

Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς —Numerous proposals of reconstruction, but due to some lack of information a final compelling answer has not yet surfaced.

* a hypothetical cursing to balance the confession of Lordship, “Jesus is Lord” or
* there is an implication here that some non-Christian ecstatics may have been cursing Jesus in their ecstatic state?
* Or perhaps even something the Corinthian believers did, i.e. call on Jesus to curse others?
* A slogan used as an accusation against Jesus/Christians (perhaps some Jewish criticism in the debate about who Jesus really was).
* In 110 CE, Pliny the Younger gave an order to “revile” Christ (Fitzmyer, 456)
* Winter’s reconstruction is “Jesus gives/grants anathema” was used by some Christians in their conflicts/divisions due to past worldly practices. “…the thesis of this book. It has been argued that the inroads of paganism were seen in the way Christians reacted to others in an adversarial situation whether in their Christian [assembly] or outside of it.” (*After*, 183)

 **“Jesus is Lord”** (12:3) is not a mere verbalization. Rather, it **is a confessional truth** even in formula form (cf. **Rom 10:9**).

IN CONCLUSION TO 12:1-3, many have wondered what 12:1-3 has to do with gifts in chs. 12-14 and therefore often pass over this portion with haste. But **12:1-3 is programmatic** for the context of chs. 12-14. **The whole issue of the proper use of special gifts relates to the Lordship of Christ.** Compare the close of chs. 12-14 in 14:37-38, which balances Jesus as Lord of 12:1-3.

 **2a. The Sovereign Lord has ordained unity and diversity in the domain of spiritual gifts (12:4-31).**

After the introduction of 12:1-3, Talbert sees a chiasm with the remaining section (p. 81):

 A Spiritual gifts (12:4-30)
 B Proper motivation in manifesting the gifts (12:31-14:1a)
 A’ Spiritual gifts (14:1b-40)

Talbert also proposes an aba’ pattern for 12:4-30. This outline does not follow the suggestion. Garland presents an entirely different chiastic plan for 1 Cor 12-14!

 **1b. Unity and diversity is observed in the distribution of gifts (vv. 4-11).**

 1c. There is diversity of spiritual expressions, but unity in terms of the origin of these expressions (vv. 4-6).

Paul treats the issue of diversity within unity by analogy with the Godhead. The theme of unity and diversity is intrinsic to creation pattern. The nature of the Godhead demands unity while a variety of ministries and manifestations characterize the persons of the Godhead. It is a “diversity grounded in unity” (Thiselton).

Note the marked pattern of repetition in these verses.

 διαιρέσεις ... τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα allotments/different kinds/varieties

 … but the same Spirit

 διαιρέσεις ... καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος ditto … but the same Lord

 διαιρέσεις ... ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς θεὸς ditto … but the same God

This same emphasis continues in 12:7-11, by each believer being singled out to receive an endowment from the one Spirit. Note the crescendo in 12:11— τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα

**At the human plain, unity is not uniformity but the ability to live with diversity.**

 2c. The diversity of gifts is delineated, but unity is found in their purpose ("common good" v. 7) and origin (v. 11) (vv. 7-11).

 1d. The distribution (12:7, 11).

12:7 & 11 provide an inclusio for this section. 12:7 introduces the Spirit’s distribution “to each one” (ἑκάστῳ) and 12:11 “to each one” closes the section. The Spirit’s goal is “for the benefit/common good” of the community/body (12:7b). By God’s design, no one is omitted from the distribution although the extent of gifting is by God’s sovereign choice (7:11).

**Think** of the non-miraculous spiritual gifts as the ***product*** **of spiritual formation**. Do you want to know what your “giftedness” is? Then get to work and wait for others to inform you as they observe your patterns and success.

 2d. The list (12:8-10).

 1e. The list as a unit

Fee notes with some disdain the variety of agendas which interpreters pursue by placing a certain interpretation upon the content and organization of this list. Much of his criticism is well taken. It is disappointing, however, that he does not note the apparent balance and organization of the list.

On the issue of tongues being last in the list, see Fee, 572, and his article in Pneuma 2 (1980): 3-14. Also cf. Fee’s note 20 on pp. 573-574, for bib. on tongues.

διὰ τοῦ πvεύματoς δίδoται-- HOW does the Spirit give? Implications?

 2e. An overview of gift lists in the NT
(Overheads; cf. Carson, 35ff.)

 **As given above in the beginning notes….**

 3e. The individual items in the list

 1f. Is it a chiasmus? **No**. But there is certainly balance and symmetry to the list.

Putting the list into “chart” form helps to see the relationship of terms:

 Word of Wisdom
 Word of Knowledge
 Faith
 Healings
 Miraculous powers
 Prophecies
 Discerning of spirits
 Tongues
 Interpretation of Tongues

**What and How does this list communicate to us? Symmetry? Balance? Center? Commonalities?**

 2f. Possible definitions

The challenge with terms in a list is that lists usually lack immediate context for the definition of the terms as terms (i.e. there is a context but not an unpacking of the individual list terms).

Anyone or any source that confidently defines the items in gift lists immediately disqualifies themselves from validity. When a term has a history in the biblical text more can be said about it, but when it does not, we may lack adequate information to finally define it.

If we accept the possible structure for this list that **the professor proposed, then all items in the list are part of the supernatural gifts rather than the working out of natural endowments** for ministry in the church. This is due to the “hinge” of miraculous powers and the nature of the items in the list. [READ the better commentaries for expansion of these terms, only brief statements are made here.]

λόγoς σoφίας (word of wisdom)

λόγoς γvώσεως (word of knowledge)

In the first doublet, “word or message” dominates. In defining these, we must at least emphasize the “message” which proceeds from wisdom and knowledge. It seems persons so gifted would convey God’s message to the congregation. Barrett calls it “instructive discourse.”

πίστις (faith)

θαμάτωv (healing)

Individually, these words are reasonably self-evident. But if they are a doublet, then we have the correlation of faith and healing as a manifestation of the Spirit. Here “faith” is not simply bland belief, but it is special because it is in this list. Is it faith to perform an extraordinary work or faith on the basis of actually having special knowledge of God’s will (which would require direct

revelatory knowledge)? If the latter is the case, then one has to wonder if we have some insight here for the statement in **James 5:13-18** about the “prayer of faith” which *will* raise the sick.

ἐvεργήματα δυvάμεωv (workings of power, mighty deeds, i.e. miraculous signs)

The working of powers/signs/miracles stands alone as the **hinge** for the list. If the structure proposed is correct, then this signals that all items in the list are under the umbrella of supernatural expressions. Cf. Mark 16:17f.; Acts 13:11

πρoφητεία (prophecy)

διακρίσεις πvευμάτωv (discerning of spirits)

Throughout biblical history, prophets are those entrusted with revealed truth with the task of conveying authoritative information to God’s people. Grudem and some theologians in the “third wave” have redefined the role of New Testament prophets from the classical category of prophet. Grudem’s proposed view **has not** been adopted by either mainline systematic theology nor by works on biblical theology. This “debate” is extensive, but briefly, Grudem recognized the classic definition of OT Prophets as “inerrant spokesmen” for God. In the OT, they were “the mouth of God.” But in the NT, Grudem related the work of the classic prophets to the apostles and then created a new definition for NT prophets,

“…the words prophet and prophecy were used of ordinary Christians who spoke not with absolute divine authority, but simply to report something that God had laid on their hearts or brought to their minds. There are many indications in the New Testament that this ordinary gift of prophecy had authority less than that of the Bible, and even less than that of recognize Bible teaching in the early church….” (*Systematic Theology*, 1051; cf. 1050-61).

Consequently, **Grudem created a new kind of prophet** who was ***not*** ultimately authoritative and could err. This definition allows some church traditions to have prophetic activity since it now does not lay claim to authoritative revelation in analogy to Scripture. This construct certainly serves certain theological paradigms. Grudem is an odd mix of Calvinism and Charismatic in his SysTheo. He was (not sure of current leanings) a major advocate for the “Third Wave” ideas while John Wimber was living. Check “The Vineyard Church” for literature from that period. Consult my “Excursus” lecture on “gifts” (Note Pack #15).

On NT prophecy see Agabus (Acts 11:28; 21:10f.); Philip’s daughters (Acts 21:9). Some call it “inspired speech.”

The “discerning of spirits” is best understood as relating to persons gifted to validate prophetic truth, discernment of genuine vs. counterfeit prophecy (e.g. 1 John 4:1-6). The phrase should **not** be applied to the issue of demonization. Cf. the post-apostolic *Didache* 11.7-10 for some early insight to the Church’s managing “subjectivism.”

γένη γλωσσῶν (genus/kinds of tongues)

ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν (interpretation of tongues)

This concluding pair, as the opening pair of wisdom and knowledge, influence seeing this list as a series of doublets joined by “the working of miracles” hinge.

“Kinds of tongues” (only here and 10:28) goes in two directions:

* Ecstatic speech / glossalalia (Smith, Morris, Barrett, Fee), Cf. 1 Cor 14
* Languages / xenologia (**Ciampa,** Forbes, Church fathers), Cf. Acts 2:4-11; 10:45-46; 19:6; Tongues in Acts seem to be languages for evangelistic or authenticating purposes.
* **1 Cor 14:22?** While 1 Cor 12 is not self-evident and early 14:1-5 seems like glossolalia; 14:22 raises the possibility of xenologia in keeping with Acts!! Consult detailed commentaries in location for expanded treatment.

See the second list in 12:27-31 where some of these items appear again.

Beginning bibliography relating to NT prophecy (a perusal of this material will provide the additional bib. one might need):

Aune, David E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Carson, D. A. *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.

Grudem, Wayne A. *The Gift of Prophecy in the New Testament and Today*. Westchester, IL.: Crossway Books, 1988.

Hill, David. *New Testament Prophecy*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.

Martin, Ralph P. *The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12-15*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

 **2b. Unity and diversity is observed in the function of gifts (12:12-31).**

 1c. The foundation of unity (12:12-13).

The metaphor of Body is most likely derived from either the OT “idea of corporate personality” (Best via Fitzmyer) or the Greek/Roman “body politic” (Fitzmyer, Thiselton) that described society of Paul’s time. Paul could easier convert either of these motifs for his purposes.

 Unity (contra. party spirit of 1:10-11; 11:18) = Body;

 Diversity = parts of the Body

The assertion that “in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body” has a broad history in church traditions, especially as related to the first and second wave of signs movements (i.e. Pentecostalism and the charismatic movement). Some general comments,

* This is the only mention of ‘baptism by the Spirit’ outside the Gospels and Acts.

 Mark 1:8 is fulfilled in Acts 2:33 (cf. 1:5; 11:16) and inaugurates the Church.

* The Holy Spirit is *not* the Baptizer but is the instrument that Christ uses to effect the inauguration of the Body. The preposition *en* translated “by” can be misleading. The “force of the prep. *en* is not clear, whether it is to be understood as instrumental or local (BDF 195, 219-220).” Using “in” or “through” is a better choice. For Christ as the Baptizer see Matt 3:11; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5.
* The significance of this metaphor:
* Provides spiritual unity for the Body (it is a metaphor)
* Breaks down ethnic barriers. The Church includes all without distinction.
* “All” eliminates using this statement to justify an elitism for some special class of spiritual persons…those who “have arrived” or “gotten it.”
* The use of baptize here is a rare figurative use, breaking from the typical water ordinance.
* Roman Corinth would have understood the principle of “Seek the welfare of the City/Body.”
* The “when” of this phrase is best taken as the “Pentecost” inauguration of the Church. It is best viewed as a forensic statement from that event that includes all who eventually believe rather than asserting a continuous repetition of the baptism every time someone believes.

On the Spirit Baptism issue see:

Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in relation to Pentecostalism today. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970.

Hoekema, Anthony A. *Tongues and Spirit-Baptism: A Biblical and Theological Evaluation*. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981 [1966].

Hunter, Harold D. *Spirit-Baptism: A Pentecostal Alternative*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983.

Lederle, Henry I. *Treasures Old and New: Interpretations of "Spirit-Baptism" in the Charismatic Renewal Movement*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988.

 2c. The rationale of diversity (12:14-26).

It seems to me that this unit is marked at 12:14 and 12:20 and 14:26 where terminal points are provided around the idea of “many” parts and “one” body. The emphasis on “many” draws all members into the circle rather than excluding anyone:

 Every believer is a necessary part of the body (12:14-16)
 Every believer needs the help of other believers (12:17-22)
 Every believer is complemented by other believers (12:23-25)

 Every believer is involved with others (12:25-26)

One cannot walk away from this and think that any part of the Body is insignificant or that any part can go it on its own. At the same time, no two are exactly alike!

 1d. Diversity is God’s plan (12:14-20)

 1e. The logic that diversity is part of God’s creative plan (12:14-17)

The issue in the various translations as to whether the series of statements are questions or assertion is noteworthy. The Greek text maintains question marks in 12:15-16 while most English versions render them as assertions. Fee comments, “The sentences are almost certainly statements (as NIV; cf. UBS3, RSV, NASB, NEB), not interrogatives (as KJV; cf. NA26 and 27 and UBS4). What makes this certain is the fact that they are present general conditions, which do not lend themselves to being interrogatives without some internal clues” (610 note 7). The meaning is still clear whether assertion or question.

 2e. The inference to be drawn: Diversity is God’s decision (12:18-20)

Note the force of 12:18, “but now God has placed….” Each clause within the sentence makes a significant point about **God’s sovereign distribution**.

Greek students should **note** that 12:11 and 12:18 reflect the synonymous nature of the two words for “will” (βούλομαι, θέλω). Some try to distinguish these synonyms to make major theological points in some texts. There interchangeability here indicates that it is a context not just a linguistic issue that provides meaning.

 2d. Unity and equality in the midst of diversity is
 God’s plan (12:21-26)

Question to ponder: How can one harness the unity and diversity of people in a ministry context as a strength?

Someone has said that “leading people is like herding warm Jello!” It does not take long in ministry to understand this imagery!! “Leadership” for ministry is not to be modelled after corporations. As one author put it, leadership is the “way of shared praxis.” That is, leaders enable followers to “own” a vision not just conform to it.

A very important but mostly unknown book is Thomas H. Groome, *Sharing Faith: A Comprehensive Approach to religious Education & Pastoral Ministry. The Way of Shared Praxis.* Harper, 1991. Groome lays out how to process ideas so that a group rather than just an individual

owns them. Power is in group ownership, not just the so-called leader. We are a BODY.

A mere perusal of Groome’s Table of Contents shows how rich his book can be (check online).

 3c. The conclusion about being a “Body” (12:27-31).

 1d. The concluding assertion of the metaphor (12:27)

 2d. The **concluding list** ranks the communication and leadership gifts first, leaving the “showy” gifts, so prized by some, for last (12:28-31).

This list has been called “an exegetical and lexicographical minefield” (Thiselton, 1013). One major issue is whether the ranking nomenclature indicates real rank or whether it is just a literary way to do the list.

While making it clear that apostles, prophets and teachers are to be preferred to the cherished gift of tongues, the list also includes what some might classify as the blandest of all gifts in any list, “helps.” In fact, this item is so off the radar screen that we have no idea how it was special enough to be called a gift! Which may help us **understand that the term “gift” is often merely a description of a “function” in the Body.** Every small Church pastor knows that a volunteer janitor is a gift from God.

This list being like Eph 4, with a focus on gifted people (the NIV interpretively translates so as to keep this emphasis throughout).

The ranking by assertion is unusual in lists. Does the ranking imply (1) order of importance; or (2) order of authority; or (3) order of NT historical precedence in founding and building the church? Fee wonders if this is not showing subordination to the apostolic group. Frankly, it is just reality. The problem is that it is one thing to recognize who “they” were in the first century but hard and controversial to recognize “who” in our current context. Certainly no one like them, but still there is some pecking order for any “body” to function properly. The first three in this list appear to be “office holders” while the remaining items are ministry functions.

**Apostle** is a term that covers the Twelve Apostles (Matt 10:1; Rev 21:14), Paul, Andronicus and Junias (Rom 16:7). The question is if this term should always be viewed as special as the Twelve and Paul or if in a gift list it could be used as a “ministry” term, allowing for a broader use of the term as applied to others. Fitzmyer comments that in this text “the apostolic role is to be understood as a form of *diakonia*, “ministry” or “service.” (482) Most do not accept an “apostolic succession” proposal (Roman Catholic, some Charistmatics) beyond the Twelve or at least the apostolic period. Having seen the risen Lord is stated as a requirement (1 Cor 9:1, 2; 15:7; cf. Acts 1:8, 21-23; See
the Jones article in the bibliography). “Dunn concedes that apostles represent in Paul a wider circle than the Twelve, but believes that they still constitute a special group of ‘founder members’ who are

personally commissioned on the basis of such passages as Rom 1:5; 11:13; 1 Cor 3:5-10; 9:1, 2; 15:7-11; Gal 1:1 and 1:11, 15-17).” (Thiselton, 1013-1014). The exact status of Andronicus and Junias are debated. Most major commentaries restrict 1 Cor 12:28 to the Twelve and Paul and that there are no successors after their time.

**NT Prophets**, like those in the OT, received accurate information directly from God. They probably also served the purpose of accurately proclaiming truth and guiding the church when apostles were not present (cf. Acts 11:27ff.; 21:10 with the activity of Agabus). Martin describes them as providing “revelation of the divine will for the congregation.”

**Teachers** are here listed without the descriptor “pastors.” The teachers were probably non-revelatory persons gifted in transmission of and explaining the “meaning and moral implications of the Christian faith” (Barrett, Gal 6:6) as given by the apostles and prophets.

The noun **“helpers”** (NRSV/ “forms of assistance”) only occurs here in the NT. It is a term of activity, meaning “do helpful deeds.” Thayer interprets it as a reference to deacons. The term has modest use in the LXX (Ps 21:20 w/21:1; 1 Esdr. viii.27; Sirach xi.12; li.7; 2 Macc. xv.7, etc.). Romans 12:8 in English sounds similar (but not same Greek), but it is probably not a parallel because money seems in view in that context.

The feminine noun (gender in Greek is not an indicator of gender but grammar) translated as “administration” (NRSV/ “forms of leadership”; NIV2011/ “of guidance”; Thiselton/ “ability to formulate strategies”) is also only used here in the NT. Its extrabiblical usage is in the context of “governing.” The counterpart masculine noun is used for the person who steers a ship.

 3d. The final concluding remark: a final confirmation of equality in the Body regardless of gifting (12:29-31).

The language structure of the questions in 12:29-30 expects/requires the answer “no.” Using a question is rhetorical but the author pins the answer down in the process (use of negative μή ).

As well as making it clear that holding “great” gifts is not necessarily what makes one great, Paul uses an interesting transition statement: “but seek the greater gifts”. And now I will show you the most excellent way.” This statement transitions the theme of 1 Cor 12 and opens 1 Cor 13. How what he says about love is superior is addressed in 13:13.

On “Tongues” in 12:30b see 12:10 and consult

12:31 provides a transition to chapter 13. Some translations close ch. 12 with 12:31a and begin the next section with 12:31b (UBS, NA28, NIV2011) while others use the chapter divisions (NRSV). With transitional verses it is basically irrelevant. The original Greek had no chapter or verse divisions. 1 Cor 12 and 13 and integrated and the text does not need to be bifurcated.

 **2. Spiritual gifts and the law of love (13:1-14:40).**

 1a. A classic statement concerning the nature of love (13:1-13).

The classic 1 Cor 13 provides a middle to the treatment of gifts of chs. 12-14. These three chapters flow together and need to be so themed. Paul frames the value of gifts in terms of the community. A community that should prize “communication” over individually spectacular expressions, perhaps even status seeking exercises. This marks the relational nature of the body and brings the ethics of the body into view. Love is the Queen of Ethics. Tongues is merely the occasion to bring a people problem to the table. What better theme to adjudicate relational ethics than the biblical principle of love.

1 Cor 13 has become an international classic that crosses almost all religious boundaries. It is good to read this text aloud and let the tones sink in aurally.

 1b. Love's importance (1-3)

The contrast of love to these representative gifts is not to bifurcate love from Christian truth but is to promote the need for both/and. Contextually, the Corinthians’ needs are dominantly social and love manages the social, community aspects. The OT presents love as a covenant loyalty regulating the relationship between God/human and human/human. Love does not create the criteria for guiding relationships but, rather, applies that criteria in community (see discussion below).

 2b. Love's actions (4-7)

This section begins with “Love is….” What is your definition of love? What is a broader biblical definition of this construct?

**Love is not merely a motivator for behavior, it is behavior.**

**LOVE’S RESULT IS RESPONSIBLE**

**ACTION**

**LOVE IS THE COGNITIVE ADJUSTMENT OF MIND, WILL, AND VALUES TO DIVINE REVELATION IN ORDER TO FULFILL THE PRECEPTIVE WILL OF GOD**

John 14:15, 21, 23, 24

Deut 6:4; 10:12; 11:1; 13:3, 4

**Love is an *activity* toward the objects loved.**

Matt 5:43-44

[NOTE: These definitions are the property of Dr. Meadors…feel free to use but be sure to give
credit for origin.]

 3b. Love's endurance (8-13)

How this section interfaces with the cessation issue will be addressed in the excursus that follows the treatment of the text.

The concluding statement of 13:13 seems awkward to some. Why did Paul note faith and hope seemingly ‘out of the blue.’ The triad of FH&L certainly fits Paul’s theology, but it seems incoherent with the present context (cf. Thiselton, 1071ff.). Garland suggests that

“Paul probably added faith and hope to love here to allow the familiar combination to balance the triad of prophecy, knowledge, and tongues. The inclusion of faith and hope also allows Paul to magnify love even more. Not only is love superior to spiritual gifts that are partial and will come to an end, but also it is superior to virtues that are absolutely essential to being a Christian.” (625)

 2a. The practical application of the concept of love (14:1-40).

Paul begins chapter 14 with the exhortation to "pursue the way of love." Evidently, the Corinthians were exercising their gifts in an irresponsible manner. A manner not befitting a philosophy of the Body as a community. The gift of tongues seems to have been the most abused. Status has probably entered the Assembly at every level. Interestingly, those who thought that tongues would provide “status” actually choose the wrong end of the continuum!

Paul's basic point in chapter 14 is that **love is more concerned with understandable communication and community edification than with outward show**.

The development of Paul's argument as set forth by Boyer is followed here (cf. pp. 131-36) with slight revisions.

 1b. Paul argues that the value of tongues is relative (14:1-19).

 1c. This relative value is observed by contrast with the gift of prophecy (14:1-5).

“…the issue in these verses clearly turns on intelligible communication or effective communicative
action between speakers and listeners.” (Thieslton, 1084, 1087; see discussion at 12:10 as well)

 Prophecy is more desirable (vv. 1, 5).
Prophecy is for the community (vv. 3, 4b).
Tongues is self-serving (v. 4).
Tongues is subordinate (v. 5b).
"Edify" in v. 5 is key (cf. vv. 3, 4, 6, 12, 19).

On understanding the meaning of “prophecy,” a number of views have been proposed (see Thieslton, 1087ff. This section lays out his observations from the defining literature):

* The definition of “prophesy” is subject to the interpretative paradigms applied to it.
* Prophecy is educational, building up a person
* Prophecy brings the OT to bear upon the developing NT (“reinterpretation [in light of Christ event] of Scripture” view by E. E. Ellis).
* Prophecy as “spontaneous” revelatory/inspired preaching (Dunn, Max Turner)
* Prophecy is focused on the believing community only.

What does 14:2, 3 tell us about the nature of tongues in this context?

Passages relating to "tongues" in a supra-natural sense (whether language or ecstatic):

 Acts 2:3, 4, 6, 11; 10:46; 19:6;

 1 Cor 12:10, 28, 30; 13:1, 8; 14:2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 27, 39

Obviously, 1 Cor has a special issue not mentioned or treated in any other epistle.
All other passages using γλῶσσα clearly refer to spoken languages.

The exact nature of tongues in 1 Cor is highly debated. While Acts texts seem to call for foreign languages, the kind of tongues in 1 Cor have not found scholarly agreement. Thiselton goes into great detail (970-988; cf. Garland 583-587) validating the views, including

* tongues as angelic speech
* tongues as miraculous power to speak other languages
* tongues as liturgical, archaic, or rhythmic phrases
* tongues as ecstatic speech
* tongues as ‘the language of the unconscious’ (ecstatic)

The only common denominator about tongues in some 1 Cor texts is that it was speech to God (not humans) that ***required* the parallel gift of interpretation in order to make it useful to the worshipping congregation.**

14:5, the lead verb may be translated “wish, desire, want, like” and represents Paul. Most all interpreters see it as concessive (although) or conciliatory. Henry Chadwick colorfully captured 14:5 by saying Paul “…pour[ed] a douche of ice-cold water over the whole practice [of tongues]”! (*NTS* 1 [1954-55], 268).

* “I would have you all speak…but rather…” (ASV)
* “Now I would like all of you…but even more…” (NRSV)
* “Now I want you all…but even more…” (ESV)
* “I would like every one of you…but I would rather...” (NIV84 and 2011)

It is interesting to me that the issue of “tongues” never rises anywhere else in the NT. Why isn’t it in Ephesians or the Pastorals, which set the pace for Church order? Furthermore, it **never** occurs in the Apostolic Fathers writings, which are the earliest witness to the Apostolic period.

 2c. This relative value is observed by the need for "understandability" (14:6-17).

 1d. The need for understandability is stated (v. 6).

 2d. The rationale of understandability is delineated (vv. 7-17).

 1e. Understandability is necessary for meaningful human communication (vv. 7-12).
 Music (vv. 7-8) Language (vv. 10-11)
 Conclusions (vv. 9, 12)

 2e. Understandability is not served by the gift of
 tongues (vv. 13-17).

 3d. The primacy of understandability is affirmed (vv. 18-19).

 2b. Paul argues that the purpose of tongues was to be a prophetic sign (14:20-25).

 1c. Paul’s initial exhortation (14:20)

The vocative of address, “brethren,” tempers Paul’s rebuke of the Corinthians’ immaturity (cf. 3:2). Interestingly, the theme of spiritual immaturity comes up again at the end of the present chapter (14:37-38). We measure our spiritual maturity by accounting for all of god’s truth, not just our area of concern. Carson notes,

“At least some Corinthians wanted to measure their maturity by the intensity of their spiritual experiences, without consideration of other constrains, such as love’s demands that brothers and sisters in Christ be edified; and thus they became ‘mature’ or advanced, wittingly or unwittingly, in evil, and immature in their thinking. Paul wants to reverse this trend.” (*Showing the Spirit*, 108)

 2c. Paul’s development of tongues as a sign (14:21-25)

Paul states clearly that tongues constituted a "sign" for unbelievers. The crucial question is to explain the nature and meaning of this "sign" (cf. Smith, pp. 41ff.).

 1d. Tongues are viewed as a sign in the same sense that Isaiah 28:11 was a sign.

The context of Isaiah 28:11 is that since Israel has rejected God’s message presented to them in their own language (28:10), they would have to learn their lesson from the foreign speech of Assyrian invaders (28:11). Thus, in Isaiah, the ‘tongues’ are a *sign of judgment* upon Israel for unbelief (cf. how 14:37-38 balances with this).

In this illustration, a “tongue” was a foreign language.

 2d. Tongues are a sign for unbelievers, not believers (14:22)

In what sense are tongues a sign to unbelievers? In the same sense that the Assyrian tongue was a sign to unbelieving Israel—it was a sign of judgment. In fact, tongues exercise a judgmental role when unbelievers view the tongues speaker as ‘mad.’

Contrast this with 14:22 ref. to prophecy as a sign to believers! (Work thru Garland 644-654.)

 3b. Paul gives the guidelines for regulating the use of gifts in the assembly (14:26-40).

 1c. The early church services were marked by (v. 26):
diversity

 participation

 edification

 2c. The regulation of tongues speaking (vv. 27-28).

 3c. The regulation of prophetic speech (vv. 29-33a).

 4c. “The regulation of the woman's role” (vv. 33b or 34-36).

1 Cor 14:33b-36… This text illustrates the importance of how a translator punctuates their work.
Does the thought of this statement begin with 33b or does 33b close 29-33? This is an interpretive
Issue!!

See the illustration of how to process/validate the interpretation of this text (the better commentaries
will walk you through a validation process… e.g. see Fitzmyer, 528-531). For skilled interpreters,
the major problem is that 34-36 is awkward with 34a and 37 in the contextual flow. Hard to
explain how it fits the flow of 1 Cor 14.

**ILLUSTRATIVE EXERCISE IN VALIDATION**

 **The Problem of 1 Cor 14:33b-36**

**[The first task is to define the problem/issue being investigated. This will require adequate pre-research in order to understand and state what the problem is].**

Apparent Problem: 1 Cor 11 validates women's participation in the public services of the church. 1 Cor 14 seems to say the direct opposite--women are to be silent without exception and consult their husbands at home.

**[Surfacing views is a paper chase. When done right, you will always think, “If I could just find one more article or book, I might really nail this.” You will discover a lot of overlap in what is stated. You use the multitude of sources to provide variety in source citations. All cited views must be supported by sources that actually hold the view cited…no secondary sources.]**

***Views Arguments Pro/Con***

1. Face value, and ignore
 1 Cor 11. (popular literature)

2. Ch. 14 prophecy context = no
authoritative teaching
(Hurley, Carson, et.al.)

3. Interpolation (Conzelmann,
Fee, Payne; several variations here)

4. Feminist's Pauline
 Patriarchalism (Fiorenza)

5. Statement relates to family
codes and not to public
assembly (Ellis)

6. Response to Corinthian
Slogan (Kaiser, Talbert; best option among many difficulties)

7. Pauline ironic sarcasm
(Allison)

 Select Bibliography on 1 Cor 14:33b-36
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Carson, D.A. "Silent in the Churches: On the Role of Women in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36." In *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*. Edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1991.

Ellis, E. Earle. "The Silenced Wives of Corinth." In *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis.* Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
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Munro, Winsome. "Women, Text and the Canon: The Strange Case of 1 Corinthians 14:33-35." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 18 (1988):26-31.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Interpolations in 1 Corinthians." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986):81-94.

Odell-Scott, David W. "Let the Women Speak in Church: An Egalitarian Interpretation of 1 Cor 14:33b-36." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 13 (1983):90-93.

 . "In Defense of an Egalitarian Interpretation of 1 Cor 14:34-36: A Reply to Murphy-O'Connor's Critique." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 17 (1987):100-103.

Talbert, Charles H. *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Revised Edition. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2002. Pp. 114ff.

 5c. These regulations have divine authority (vv. 37-38).

 6c. These regulations are designed to provide basic order (vv. 39-40).

 **BRIEF HISTORICAL OVERVIEW**

 **OF THE**

 **CHARISMATIC/RENEWAL MOVEMENT**

**Gary T. Meadors, Th.D.**

**Grand Rapids Theological Seminary**

This lecture accompanies the Notes on 1 Corinthians 12-14.

I. A BRIEF HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF HIGHLIGHTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHARISMATIC TRADITIONS IN TWENTIETH CENTURY AMERICA.

The renewal movement in America has been described historically as containing "three waves". The most concise description of this whole domain is contained in *The Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, cited in the bibliography below (see esp. the article "Statistics, Global").

The three waves created 38 categories for classification, but the continuity key is "the Renewal in the Holy Spirit as one single cohesive movement into which a vast proliferation of all kinds of individuals and communities have been drawn in a whole range of different circumstances." The Renewal movement now (stats as of 1988 and need updating) numbers 21 percent of organized global Christianity.

A. The first wave: Pentecostalism

1. What came to be called Pentecostalism began in the black and non-white community as early as 1741. The movement began in earnest in the early 1900s with an interracial aspect that continued with a varied history.

2. The landmark for the beginning of the modern Pentecostal movement in America is the Azusu Street Revival in Los Angeles, from 1906-1913. This was an interdenominational setting centering around the Apostolic Faith Mission under the leadership of William J. Seymour. Some view the published reports that were circulating about the Welsh Revival under Evan Roberts in 1904-1905 as a catalyst for renewal meetings in America. Emotionalism touches a deep felt need to provide empirical evidence that we have touched the divine.

3. The individuals who became involved in the renewal movement were soon rejected by their mainline denominations. Pentecostal denominations began to form as these individuals came together.

4. The distinctive teaching of this first wave was that "all Christians should seek a post-conversion religious experience called baptism in the Holy Spirit, and that a Spirit-baptized believer may receive one or more of the supernatural gifts known in the Early Church" (Dict, 820).

Emotionalism touches a deep felt need to provide perceived empirical evidence that we have touched the divine.

The doctrine of the second work of grace, the baptism in the Holy Spirit, has been an area of debate throughout the history of the renewal movement. See

Dayton, Donald W. *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1987.

Hoekema, Anthony A. *Tongues and Spirit-Baptism: A Biblical and Theological Evaluation*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.

Hunter, Harold D. *Spirit-Baptism: A Pentecostal Alternative*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983.

B. The second wave: Charismatic Renewal

The second wave is identified as beginning in the 1950s. Individuals within the mainline denominations adopted pentecostal doctrine along with the alleged exercise of supernatural gifts. These individuals formed sub-groups within their denominations, spawned new works including business men's associations, but they generally did not join Pentecostal churches. Statistics of 1988 state that over a 25 year period the charismatic group swelled to over 16 million Protestants and 35 million Roman Catholics.

Quebedeaux, Richard. *The New Charismatics II*. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

On the prominent Catholic renewal movement see:

Bord, Richard J. and Faulkner, Joseph E. *The Catholic Charismatics: The Anatomy of a Modern Religious Movement*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983.

C. The third wave: "Third wavers"!

1. The third wave views itself as significantly different than the first and second wave while still holding the supernatural gifts of the Spirit as

 normative for the church today. Consequently, they have adopted neither the label Pentecostal nor Charismatic. The descriptor "third wave" was coined by Peter Wagner of Fuller Theological Seminary, in a 1983 article, and popularized by his 1988 book, *The Third Wave of the Holy Spirit* (Ann Arbor: Servant Books, 1988). The forward to this book was by John Wimber (now viewed as the key person in the Vineyard Movement) and the third wave movement is closely associated with Wimber and Wagner although other groups have pursued its ideals without direct ties to Wimber.

Wagner's article "Third Wave" in Dict. (843-44) summarizes the ideals of the movement. **[INSERT]**

2. The third wave movement is closely associated with and defined by the writings of John Wimber.

Wimber, John with Springer, Kevin. *Power Evangelism*. New York: Harper and Row, 1986.

Wimber, John with Springer, Kevin. *Power Healing*. New York: Harper Collins, 1987.

An up-to-date bibliography of materials (including responses to their critics) may be obtained by contacting: Association of Vineyard Churches

3. The third wave movement has influenced many levels of evangelical Christianity.

1a. Fuller Theological Seminary

Fuller Seminary has become a popular school for charismatics of all kinds to pursue graduate theological and ministry degrees. The school has provided them with a friendly, accepting environment and a theological pluralism which allows them to pursue their own systems through the doctoral level.

Peter Wagner and John Wimber offered an experimental course in January 1982, entitiled "MC510 Signs, Wonders and Church Growth". This course was stimulated by the third world students at Fuller who claimed that renewal in their countries included the miraculous work of the Spirit, especially physical healing. The Church Growth school at Fuller has activily pursued third wave motifs.

"Christian Life Magazine" produced a book type compilation of MC510 and distributed it in 1982.

2a. Dallas Theological Seminary

On December 9, 1987, Don Campbell, then president of DTS, circulated a letter announcing the dismissal of three professors "over the question of adherence to the Seminary's noncharismatic doctrinal stance and practice". These men were released in the middle of an academic year: Dr. Walter R. Bodine (Ph.D. Harvard), Dr. Jack S. Deere, and Dr. Donald S. Sunukjian.

Since that time, Jack Deere has become a major apologist for the third wave. His first book, *Surprised by the Power of the Spirit* (Zondervan, 1993), provided a passionate testimony of his conversion to non-cessationism. He has promised a trilogy of volumes to present his case (*Surprised by the Voice of God*. Zondervan, 1997).

The defection of high level scholars from a classic cessationist institution illustrates the level to which the third wave has infiltrated American evangelicalism.

3a. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

A prominent former faculty member at TEDS is Dr. Wayne Grudem. Grudem has been a major apologist for the third wave. He has been most active in professional theological meetings in presenting non-cessationist arguments and has published a number of responses to the critics of Wimber. Grudem endeavored to redefine NT prophets and prophecy in his *The Gift of Prophecy in the NT and Today* (Crossway, 1988). He argued that NT prophets are not in total continuity with the OT. NT prophets speak merely non-authoritative human words unless divinely confirmed. They may even speak erroneous words. He has recently released a major volume on systematic theology, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Zondervan, 1994), although this work is much broader than third wave interest.

4a. Regent University (formerly CBN University)

Regent in Virginia Beach, VA, is a mixture of waves, but primarily second wave in origin and tradition.

Cf. J. Rodman Williams. *Renewal Theology: Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective.* Three Volumes (Zondervan, 1988ff.).

D. Conclusions and Observations

1. The global power and influence of renewal theology is well established.

2. All three waves of renewal ideologies have come of age academically. Dissenters of their views no longer face pamphlets but dissertations to refute.

3. The average Christian is subject to the influence of the experiencial argument. The dictum "a person with an experience is never at the mercy of a person with an argument," often rules the day. There is also a naïve “hermeneutic of continuity” that is used to claim activity now as it was in the apostolic age.

4. The non-cessationist seem to have a biblical argument since they merely claim total continuity between the Bible and 1st century Church with the Church today (“hermeneutic of continuity”).

5. The definition of the miraculous has broadened so much that mere emotional victories are equated with miracle power (Walt Bodine illustration). Claiming a miracle takes on a variety of different semantic dimensions, e.g. how one defines “miracle.”

6. The cessationists must rest their case on theological arguments and suspend answering the numerous experiencial arguments. Remember the philosophical dictum--"Things are not always as they appear". After all, the bottom line issues in this whole debate are epistemological. (Even Wimber admitted on Peter Jennings special that much of the activity in his services is self-induced, but it provides healing for the participant and is therefore OK. Bodine is an example of psychological healing in my opinion.).

II. THE ISSUE OF THE CESSATION OR NON-CESSATION OF MIRACULOUS CHARISMATA.

The terms cessation and non-cessation are the labels for how one views the non continuation or continuation of miraculous gifts in the church. The cessationist argues that the miraculous gifts were sign gifts and that they ceased with the end of the apostolic age. The non-cessationist argues that everything present in the first century church continues throughout all of church history. The claim that even apostles exist today is becoming more prominent.

THE FOLLOWING ANALYSIS HAS NOT YET INCORPORATED THE “VIEWS BOOK” DATA…PLEASE DO THIS AS YOU GO AND MAKE IT PART OF OUR CLASS DISCUSSION.

A. The cessationist position

1. General theological characteristics and presuppositions attendant to cessationism

1a. A calvinistic view of history and theology

 Calvinistic theological traditions have argued for the cessation of miraculous charismata on several bases. These arguments provide "lines of reason" which argue for the cessation of miraculous gifts. When weighed together, they provide a sound theological explanation for a variety of key questions relating to the nature, function and longevity of miraculous gifts.

 Westminster Theological Seminary faculty have often led the charge for cessationism. This is a reformed seminary.

2a. Not dependent upon dispensational ideas, although this tradition is usually cessationist (but cf. the dominant presence of dispensationalism in Pentecostalism!). Pentecostals adopted the dispensational framework as dogma except for cessationism (Cf. Dict., 771).

3a. Scripture is viewed as complete and sufficient, and therefore, no current revelatory processes are needed nor at work.

4a. A pneumatology which views the Spirit as attendant to the Word rather than above and beyond it.

5a. View the apostles as unique to the apostolic age, specially gifted by God (along with others as well during that time, but especially them) to authenticate, proclaim, and supervise the inscripturation of God's Word and serve as Christ’s foundation for the church.

6a. Miraculous works, although always a revelatory explication of God in some way, are primarily designed to authenticate God's message and/or messenger. They are, therefore, evidential (contrary to Jon Reuthven who argues that miracles are for ministry rather than evidential. pp. 23, 189).

7a. Miraculous intervention, whether via miracle or revelatory processes, is not God's means of personal guidance in the present era.

2. Representative cessationists and their literature

1a. B.B. Warfield (1851-1921)

Warfield is viewed as the American "father" of the cessationist argument. Warfield, however, merely followed in the train of the Reformers, particularly John Calvin. Warfield’s material must also be read as a polemic during his time against the Roman Catholic Church claim to miracles, which was also often the focus of those who preceded him.

Non-cessationist literature likes to single out and attack Warfield. This is often done without recognizing the *sitz im leben* of Warfield's work or of later writers (e.g. Gaffin) who placed Warfield's arguments into a more technical exegetical package.

Warfield's primary publication:

Warfield, B. B. Counterfeit Miracles. Reprint. Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1976 [1918].

Warfield provides a history of the claims of the perpetuation of miraculous gifts. It was first published in 1918 and reflects that era, especially certain Roman Catholic activity/claims. It briefly provides some theological arguments for cessation, but the style of writing and argument does not give a thorough exegetical base for the arguments. Warfield's theological arguments proposed a three-fold polemic for cessationism:

\* Miracles accompany special epochs of redemptive history but are not normal operating procedure;

\* Miracles attended the Apostolic age and were not the continuing property of the Church;

\* Miracles authenticated the apostolic message as a revelation from God and when that message was inscripturated, this aspect of authentication ceased.

 See Warfield’s book on *Perfectionism* and his multi volume *Collected Writings* for more material.

2a. Richard Gaffin

Richard Gaffin's *Perspectives on Pentecost* is widely recognized by non-cessationists as the publication to refute. Yet, they often attack the antiquated Warfield and put Gaffin in their footnotes. Gaffin's volume was stimulated by, at that time, a forthcoming dissertation by Wayne Grudem on "The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians". Grudem's endeavor to redefine prophecy concerned Gaffin and he published his volume as a balance/refutation of what he knew would soon be a challenge.

The articles by R. Fowler White are particularly helpful to understand the debate between Gaffin and Grudem.

Gaffin's arguments for cessationism will be delineated below.

**Gaffin, Richard B., Jr. *Perspectives on Pentecost: New Testament Teaching on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit*. Phillipsburg, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1979.**

 . "The New Testament as Canon." In *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic*. Edited by Harvie M. Conn. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.

Reymond, Robert L. *What About Continuing Revelations and Miracles in the Presbyterian Church Today?* Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1977.

**White, R. Fowler**. "Gaffin and Grudem on Eph 2:20: In Defense of Gaffin's Cessationist Exegesis." *Westminster Theological Journal* 54 (1992):303-320.

 . "Reflections on Wayne Grudem's ETS 1992 Presentation, `The New Testament Gift of Prophecy: A Response to My Friends'." Unpublished paper read at the Eastern Region Annual Meeting of the ETS, April 2, 1993.

 . "Richard Gaffin and Wayne Grudem on 1 Cor 13:10: A Comparison of Cessationist and Noncessationist Argumentation." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 35 (June 1992):173-181.

3a. Robert L. Saucy

In the recent publication *Are Miraculous Gifts For Today? Four Views* (Zondervan, 1996), Saucy argues for an “open but cautious” view (which is merely a humble classical cessationist view).

4a. Additional cessationist literature

Chantry, Walter J. *Signs of the Apostles: Observations on Pentecostalism Old and New*. Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1973.

Edgar, Thomas R. *Miraculous Gifts: Are they for Today?* Neptune, N.J.: Loizeaux Brothers, 1983.

Murray, John J. "Have Miraculous Gifts Ceased? A Review Article." *The Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology*, 3:2 (1985):55-59.

3. The classic cessationist argument that miraculous sign gifts ceased with the end of the apostolic age (cf. Gaffin, et.al. above for expansion).

1a. The foundational character of the Apostles and Prophets

1b. The apostolic witness

For the cessationists, the apostolic age was unique and restricted to the time of the Twelve. Several characteristics emerge:

 1c. Apostles were the vehicles of revelation (Eph 3:5)

 2c. Apostle was an office, not just a gift (Eph 4:11)

 3c. The apostolic age was unique, authenticating and foundational.

Ephesians 2:20 uses the metaphor of “foundation” to describe the apostles. It is claimed that this implies an initial and once-for-all setting (cf. Farnell’s articles; cf. White; Gaffin).

Texts that reflect the need to authenticate the claim to be an apostle:

 2 Cor 12:12 “signs of an apostle” [Deere, 104, dative behind passive verb?]

 Heb 2:3b.-4 “were confirmed”

2b. Prophets and Prophecy (Cf. Farnell; Max Turner’s criticisms of Grudem’s reconstruction [16f.])

Cessationists see apostles and prophets as distinct offices working in consort with similar enablement (Eph 2:20 continued). NT prophets are in continuity with OT prophets and apostles are merely added to the mix.

Wayne Grudem has proposed a reenginering of the traditional definition of a NT prophet. His basic thesis is to maintain authoritative, inerrant revelation in the hands of the apostles but to seperate the NT prophets from the same authority as OT prophets and apostles. One of his theses is to equate apostles with prophets and translate 2:20 as, “apostles who are prophets.” He claims that the Granville Sharp rule equates the two. Wallace, however, notes that there are no such examples in plural forms. See Farnell, Wallace, et.al. for critiques of Grudem’s proposals.

2a. The temporary nature of the Apostolate

1b. The use of apostle in the NT (cf. a0πόστoλoς, a0πoστoλή, ἀπoστέλλω).

1c. A broad use

Romans 16:7 “…Andronicus and Junias, my relatives who have been in prison with me. They are outstanding among the apostles, and they were in christ before I was.”

 cf. Epp, Eldon Jay. *Junia: the First Woman Apostle.* Fortress Press, 2005.

1 Corinthians 15:5, 7 in light of the chronology of these events.

Are these usages indicating that the special office of apostle was broadened or is the term merely used to identify special envoys? The Greek terms can serve all these purposes, so ones “spin” on the terms will determine one’s view.

2c. A specific use

Herron’s WTJ article argues that (1) the early church knew the difference between apostle as an office and those who are merely “sent;” and (2) Paul’s struggle for recognition as an apostle reflects its exclusive status. Herron comments,

“the challenge to Paul’s apostolate and his struggle to secure recognition for it is, as we have seen above, good evidence that this circle was exclusive and that it was possible, at least in principle, to identify an apostle on the basis of certain accepted criteria.”

2b. The office of apostle was temporary and is restricted to the first century.

Lightfoot’s classic study of apostle cites them as a “rank” (i.e. special office). He notes that such rank is validated by “tests of an apostle”:

* One who has seen the resurrected Christ (1 Cor 9:1-2)
* One who performs apostolic signs (2 Cor 12:12; cf. Heb 2:2-4)

We can add to this an attitude of “fathering” the church (cf. 1 Thess 2:7f.) and Lightfoot’s observation that the leading church fathers still viewed themselves as distinct from apostles.

1c. Paul states that this aspect requires that one be an eye witness of the resurrected Christ.

Jn 15:27

Acts 1:8

1:21, 22

10:41

Paul argued from this vantage point for himself:

1 Cor 9:1-2

15:8f.

Cf. Acts 9:3-8

22:6-11

26:12-18

 2c. Paul notes the “signs of an apostle”

 2 Cor 12:12; cf. Heb 2:2-4

 While not a “sign,” the “apostolic attitude” may reflect the special nature of the office.

 1 Thess 2:7f.

 1 Cor 1-4; 14:37-38

 3 John

3c. Paul views himself as the "last" apostle in this special sense.

1 Cor 15:8ff. (cf. 1 Cor 4:9)

Peter Jones extensive study of Paul as the “last” apostle provides a fresh slant on Paul’s self-image of the apostolic office. (Jones’s view of Paul as the last of the special apostles is supported by Jurgen Becker, *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles*, 79.) This point interfaces well with the fact that the early church fathers viewed themselves as distinct from the apostles (Lightfoot).

4c. The provision of the "pastoral epistles" without any implication of apostolic succession supports the temporary proposal (Gaffin, 90-91).

One way to test a view of reconstruction is to take the tenants of the view and see if they “predict” what actually happened in the future. The fulfillment of “predictability” of a model is crucial to support its validity.

What would a cessationist’s model predict? A non-cessationist’s model? How do these relate to church history? Is the history “clean” or mixed?

3a. The interpretation of 1 Corinthians 13:10

A popularized interpretation of 1 Cor 13:10 emerged during the debate on when tongues would cease. In popular level cessationism, 1 Cor 13:10 was interpreted as having reference to a completed canon. The resulting argument was that when NT Scripture was completed, the miraculous sign gifts ceased their purpose and thus their function. While this was a handy proof text in the polemic, sound exegesis among cessationist calls for a different understanding of 1 Cor 13:10.

**Notes on 13:10--"When that which is perfect is come"**

1b. The flow of 1 Cor 13:8-12 itself

 1c. In this paragraph, the enduring nature of love is contrasted with the temporary
 nature of other gifts and even life itself.

 2c. The logical flow…

 13:9 the state of “gift” knowledge is “in part” (ἐκ μέρους)

 13:10 the “in part” state will give way to a “complete” (τὸ τέλειον)
 state

 13:11 the child/adult way of knowing illustrates the nature of knowledge

 13:12 summarizes the flow

 The point of this logic is *the nature of knowledge not a chronology of process*.

 3c. The “in part” kind of knowledge

 1d. Contextual concern is not cessationism, but consumation and the doing away with “in part” kind of things. Paul’s focus is on the nature of “states of knowledge.” (cf. Gaffin, White).

 2d. The “in part” matches “as a child” (ὡς νήπιος) in 13:11. Both phrases are a slam against Corinthian pride of gifts and their attitude of ‘triumphalism’ (White, 92).

 3d. The “in part” of 13:9 relates to the nature of knowledge derived from the gift domain, a domain that is ultimately inadequate and to be superceded. Therefore, why exalt such things now? This is a point against triumphalism. Furthermore, “in part” prophecy is a unique aspect of the historical unfolding of redemption. Prophecy is not “imperfect” (contra Grudem), it is just incomplete.

2b. There are three major positions which arise in the discussion of this phrase.

1/ It is popular to identify the perfect as the completed canon of Scripture (Charles Smith, *Tongues*, 73ff. of his 1st edition. His 2nd edition shifted to a modify eschaton view; a host of track type writings).

1a. This position is not well represented in critical commentary literature (if at all recognized by it). It has primarily been advocated in the non-charismatic literary polemic. [one partial exception is Robert L. Reymond, *What About Continuing Revelations and Miracles in the Presbyterian Church Today?* Presbyterian and Reformed pub. co., 1977]

2a. The basic thrust of this argument is that

1b. the term "perfect" here does not have reference to absolute perfection but to maturity (cf. 1 Cor 2:6; 14:20).

2b. the supplied pronoun "that which" is neuter and therefore does not refer to Christ which is masculine.

3b. verse 10 must balance with vv. 8-9. That is, sign gifts are being phased out while a completed canon is phased in. 13:10 could not refer to the 2nd advent since it will actually intensify prophecy rather than do away with it. [Cf. Mare in the Expositor’s Bible Commentary, in.loc., for a brief refutation of a completed canon view]

2/ The mature body view (see Robert L. Thomas, *Understanding Spiritual Gifts*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1978; cf. also the Master’s Journal)

This view is an adaptation of the completed canon view. It focuses on the "maturing of the church" in the apostolic period from a number of perspectives, including a completed canon. This variation has not been adopted as particularly cogent.

3/ "Perfect" is a reference to some aspect of the eschaton (some say rapture, some second coming, and some the eternal state [Charles Smith, 2nd edition]).

1a. This is by far the majority opinion and is well represented in the critical literature over a long period of time (e.g. Carson, Bruce, Barrett, Conzelmann, Mare, Godet, Lenski...).

2a. The basic thrust of this argument is that

1b. only the eschaton can give us the full knowledge stated in 13:12.

2b. the term translated "perfect" (τέλoς) is used elsewhere for the 2nd advent (cf. 1 Cor 1:8; 15:24; Js 5:11; Rev 20:5, 7; 21:6; 22:13).

CONCLUSION: It seems to me that Paul has the eschaton in view (consider "when...then...now"). The point of 1 Cor 13 is not to delineate when sign gifts would cease (i.e. not chronology but nature of knowledge) but to point out their inadequacy and temporariness in the larger picture of God's plan of history (although they will eventually cease). Holding this position, however, does not mean that one accepts the continuation of sign gifts outside the apostolic age (e.g. cf. Gaffin and Smith). It does mean that the argument for cessation is a theological construct based on texts from other contexts and the larger nature of the apostolic era.

It is interesting to note that Jewish Rabbis viewed prophecy as ceased with the OT prophets (cf. Greenspahn, “Why Prophecy Ceased,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 [1989]:37-49).

B. The non-cessationist position

1. General theological characteristics and presuppositions attendent to non-cessationism

For the Non-cessationist, Jon Ruthven's volume, *On the Cessation of the Charismata*, is the most thorough apologetic for this view that I have been able to locate. Its careful and full documentation is impressive, even at times providing clear evidence for the history of the rival view! The following items provide an overview of the theological climate of this position.

1a. A non-calvinistic view of history and theology (Ruthven constantly points out these sorts of contrasts)

2a. "Miracle charismata" is viewed as conveying revelation rather than validating it; is viewed as for edification rather than evidential (cf. Ruthven, 79; 187; 191-92; 193-194; 196).

3a. Their view of "signs of the apostles" as normative for all Christians rather than evidential in relation to the Apostles (cf. Ruthven, 104ff.).

4a. Many redefine the apostolate and therefore see it as a continuing "gift" (Ruthven, 216-220, esp. 219). Ruthven posits that there are apostles, in the full NT sense, today.

5a. A view of Scripture and Revelation as ongoing rather than complete and sufficient (cf. Ruthven on a non-complete canon, 97-98; 112ff; 146; 187-88).

6a. Review the five statements by Ruthven, pp. 203-205.

2. Representative non-cessationists and their literature

1a. Jon Ruthven, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.

The most detailed challenge to cessationism is presented by Ruthven in the below cited book. It is a high level academic project published by a highly respected academic publisher.

Ruthven, Jon. *On the Cessation of the Charismata: The Protestant Polemic on Postbiblical Miracles*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

2a. Jack Deere, former professor at Dallas Theological Seminary

Jack Deere is currently the popularizer of charismatic views. He converted to these views while a professor at Dallas and, by virtue of his background, understands the cessationist tradition and is thereby skilled at manipulating a reader to sympathize with his new position. Deere intends to produce a series of three or four volumes to argue the non-cessationist position.

Deere, Jack. *Surprised by the Power of the Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993.

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. *Surprised by the Voice of God: How God Speaks Today through Prophecies, Dreams, and Visions*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Because of the influence of Deere, especially since it is backed by an intense marketing campaign, the following critiques will prove helpful.

Mayhue, Richard L. "Who Surprised Whom? The Holy Spirit or Jack Deere?" The *Master's Seminary Journal* 5 (Fall 1994):123-140.

White, R. Fowler. "For the Sparrow in the Hurricane, A Review of Jack Deere's *Surprised by the Power of the Spirit*." Unpublished paper presented at the March 4, 1994, ETS Eastern Region Meeting.

3a. Additional literature

The renewal movement wing of the American church, whether longstanding denominations or third wave groups, has become prolific in publishing its views. A recent major publisher of this literature is Hendrickson Publishers of Peabody, Massachusetts, 01961-3473.

 The Vineyard Church also maintains an active website: [www.vineyardusa.org](http://www.vineyardusa.org)

3. The non-cessationist arguments that all miraculous gifts of the first century continue throughout Church history (Ruthven, 123ff.).

1a. Non-cessationists claim to take the NT at face value in all that it states concerning the first century as normative for the entire Church age. They demand an “hermeneutic of continuity,” although all positions fudge on something!

2a. Miraculous spiritual gifts equip the Church for ministry until the end of the age. Miracles are *not* evidential, but are an essential part of normative ministry (cf. Ruthven, 188 and on into chapter 4).

3a. Ruthven particularly reduces apostolic “office” to merely a form of “spiritual gifts,” there is no special distinction between office and gift-function.

4a. Texts claimed for support

1b. 1 Cor 1:4-8

2b. Eph 4:7-13

3b. 1 Cor 13:8-12 (cf. R. Fowler White's articles)

4b. Other texts (Ruthven, 159-187)--viewed through the presuppositions posited in 1c-3c. above.

5b. Observations on the issues of continuity vs. discontinuity between the apparent nature of first century gifts and those exercised today.

1c. Grudem's hermeneutical gymnastics to shift revelatory-authoritative prophecy to the Apostles and view NT prophecy as a sort of congregational Spirit impressionism betrays a form of reductionism in the effort to square claims with current reality.

2c. *Many who sympathize with current charismatic expressions* also note areas of discontinuity with the first century expressions.

1d. Max Turner (see bib.)

In his section 2.3, "What Relationship Exists Between the Gifts Discussed in the New Testament and Those Exhibited in Charismatic Circles?", Turner evaluates tongues speech, prophecy and healing. He sees the greater problem with tongues, the NT suggesting xenolalia rather than glossolalia. Discontinuity with NT prophecy is in the area of its "foundational" role. Healing varies, but perhaps is more continuous.

Cf. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, ch. 11

2d. J.I. Packer, *Keep in Step with the Spirit*, 207-217.

Packer's chapter 6, "Mapping the Spirit's Path: Interpreting the Charismatic Life", wrestles with how to interpret the claimed experiences of the charismatic. They assume the experience to be what they claim it to be, but when tested against biblical standards, their claim is found wanting. Consequently, two options exist:

"either to reject the experiences as delusive and possibly demonic in origin, after all, or to **retheologize** [italics mine] them in a way which shows that the truth which they actually evidence and confirm is something different from what the charismatics themselves suppose. This is the choice we now have to make with regard to at least the main stream of charismatic testimony" (p. 201).

Packer endeavors to be kind in explaining that charismatics do have experiences but they are **NOT** the NT gifts as explained by Paul.

4. A major problem derived from non-cessationism: A continuing apostolate (cf. Ruthven's Appendix II, "Does the Spiritual Gift of Apostleship also Continue?". His answer is "yes".)

 5. Issues to discuss:

 1a. What motivates/drives non-cessationists to have an open revelatory continnum? What do they view “at stake?” (cf. Ruthven, 50)

 2a. Repeat this question for cessationists.

C. Conclusions

The issue of cessationism touches numerous areas of biblical interpretation and theology, including bibliology, pneumatology, epistemology, testing conflicting authorities on the interpretation of experience, the nature of the Kingdom of God during various eras, Calvinism versus non-calvinistic systems, et.al.

Bottom line issue = epistemology, so Exercise caution in "will of God" forms, spiritual warfare discussions, ideas of illumination.
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IV. Paul’s Response to a Written communiqué from Corinth (7:1-16:4; cf. 7:1)
 A. Paul’s Response to Issues of Sex and Marriage (7:1-40)
 B. Paul's Response to the Question of Food Sacrificed to Idols (8:1-11:1)
 C. Paul's Response to the Questions of Public Worship (11:2-34)
 D. Paul's Response to the Questions Concerning Spiritual Gifts (12:1-14:40).

**E. Paul's Response to Questions Concerning the After-Life and Resurrection (15:1-58)**

**Section Summary:**

1 Cor. 15 is the classic chapter in the New Testament concerning the subject of resurrection. In our English versification, **15:1-2 and 15:58 give us literary boundaries via “Brethren” / [not] “in vain”**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 15:1-21Cor. 15:1   Now I make known unto you brethren, the 1gospel which I 2preached unto you, which also ye received, wherein also ye stand,  2 by which also ye are saved, **if ye hold fast 3the word which I 4preached unto you, except ye believed 5in vain.** | 15:5858 Wherefore, my beloved brethren, **be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not 30vain in the Lord.** |

In this chapter Paul deals with 3 major aspects of resurrection **[See Talbert].**

 **1. The resurrection of Christ (15:1-11)**

**2. The resurrection of the dead in response to two Corinthian assertions (15:12-34)**

**3. The resurrection body in response to two Corinthian questions (15:35-58)**

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

**1. The resurrection of Christ (15:1-11)**

1a. The resurrection of Christ is a vital aspect of the "gospel" message (15:1-2).

 Note how 15:1-2 and 11 provide boundaries (“preached”).

 Preach / received / stand / saved

2a. The resurrection of Christ is affirmed from two historical perspectives (15:3-8 = ONE sentence in the Greek).

 I delivered

 what I received
 that Christ died for our sin … according to the Scriptures
 buried, raised on third day … according to the Scriptures
 appeared to Cephas 15:5-8

What Scripture (has to be OT) is Paul referencing? The standard answer is that Paul draws on the “Servant of the Lord” motif in Isaiah 53:5-12 (cf. 1 Peter 2:22-25). The Gospels portray Jesus baptism in terms of the anointed Servant of the Lord. Interestingly, Paul himself picks up the gauntlet of the Servant of the Lord and applies it to himself in the Book of Acts (See Eduard Fudge, “Paul’s Apostolic Self-Consciousness at Athens.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 14 [1971]: 193-198.)

“…he was raised on the third day…” The phrase “third day” is the crucial issue in the chronological puzzle of Jesus’ crucifixion and time in the tomb before resurrection (See Harold Hoehner, *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ*. Zondervan). The phrase “three days and three nights” is subservient to “the third day.”

 Christ's resurrection is firmly founded in traditional (“received”) and
 scientific history (was seen).

 1b. Tradition history (15:3-4) “received)

1 Cor 15:3-5 seems to be part of the early *homologia* (confession) of the Early Church. Such statements were used as catechism with new converts and baptism.

The confessional statements that have survived in the NT are a fascinating study into early Christian consciousness. See Vernon H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (Brill, 1963).

When you read commentaries, they were talk about the “kerygma” of the Early Church. The term kerygma means “proclamation” and has become a technical term for the “preaching of the Early Church.”

 2b. Scientific [observation] history (15:5-8) “was seen”

 3a. The resurrection of Christ and its impact on Paul (15:9-11)

 Paul’s self validation among the apostles (9-10 = one sentence in Greek).

 15:11, “I” or “They” … we proclaimed and you believed.

**2. The resurrection of the dead: Two Corinthian Assertions (15:12-34)** [See Talbert’s structural analysis]

 1a. Paul responds to denials of the resurrection of the dead (15:12-19).

 1b. The **First Corinthian Assertion**: 15:12, “There is no
 resurrection of the dead”

 2b. Paul’s Response: 15:13-18

 No resurrection, No Christianity.

2a. Paul responds to the short-sightedness of the “Corinthian over-realized eschatology.”

1b. The **Second Corinthian Assertion**: 15:19, If we only have hope

now and not in the future, we are to be pitied (= their misunderstanding).

 2b. Paul’s Response: 15:20-34

 1c. A Three-fold Reponse:

 1d. Paul affirms the resurrection of the dead and
 explains its significance (15:20-28)

 2d. Baptism and Eschatology (15:29; cf. Rom 6:5)

“Baptized for the dead” is a notoriously difficult phrase to interpret. Fee states that every view must be held as tenative. Godet counted 30 interpretations! Thiselton list 13 “valid” proposals (1232-1248). Suggestions for its meaning include:

* “The phrase can mean, ‘in place of the dead,’ i.e., **proxy baptism** for friends or relatives who had died unbaptized (BDAG, 1031).” (Fitzmyer, 581. Roman Catholic perspective) This view is also called “vicarious baptism.” It is probably the majority opinion.
* Living people **turn to Christ and are baptized because of the testimony of believing loved ones** who have died in Christ with the hope of meeting them in the final resurrection. (Herman Hoyt)
* Thiselton opts for “baptism for [the sake of] the dead,” meaning a **testimony of the living in hope of being united with the dead in the resurrection** (1248-1249). Thieslton’s category has variations that capture the proxy baptism idea.

 3d. Resurrection in the future motivates suffering now!
 (15:30-32)

 The prospect of the eschaton is a common motivational appeal in the Bible.

 2c. A Parting Comment: 15:33-34, Wise up!!

 **3. The resurrection body (15:35-58)**

In this section Paul seems to be responding to an unbelieving question such as "How can man possibly rise when their bodies have disintegrated?" Paul considers such unbelief to be foolish (15:36).

 Paul sees this objection as containing **two questions**: **How** and with **what form?** (**15:35**)

Once again, I find Talbert’s (dependent on Jeremias!) structural analysis helpful. This section, however, presents a challenge in flow:

“Verses 33-58 consist of two Corinthian questions followed by their Pauline answers **in reverse order** [emphasis mine]. The first question, “How are the dead raised?” (v. 35a), is answered in vv. 50-57. The second question, “With what kind of body do they come?” (v. 35b), is answered in vv 36-49 (Jeremias, 1951).”

1a. **The Second Question: “With what kind of body will they come?” (15:35b) is addressed in 15:36-49.**

Interestingly, in Mediterranean antiquity as now, this is a standard “objecting question” about resurrection. Paul’s response is twofold:

1b. Continuity and Discontinuity, the “same” but “different” (15:36-44a)

 **The mechanics** of such an event are already apparent in certain universal principles.

 The principle of death (15:36)
 The principle of change (15:37)
 The principle of God's sovereignty (15:38a)
 The principle of continuity (15:38b)
 The principle of adaptability of created kinds (15:39-41)

**The perspective of form**: What form will the resurrection body have? (15:42-45). Paul describes the form of the resurrection by a series of
 contrasts that suggest the nature of the form of the resurrection body. These
 contrasts fall into two categories: conceptual and personal.

 The first category is a series of conceptual contrasts that express the newness of the form of the resurrection body (15:42-44a).

* A new life principle: corruptible (i.e. perishable) to incorruptible (15:42)
* A new value: dishonor to glory (15:43a)

 "dishonor" = "absence of glory"
 What good is a dead body?

* A new strength: weakness to power (15:43b).
* A new domain: natural to spiritual (15:44a)

2b. A contrast between Adam and Christ to express the foundation of the form of the resurrection body (15:44b-49)

 The creative and historical pattern demands a future
 hope and thus a body that is adapted to a new domain.

 Living, quickening 15:49 (cf. Phil. 3:21 spirit 1 Jn. 3:2)

2a. **The First Question: “How are the dead raised?” (15:35a)
 is addressed in 15:50-58.**

Paul’s answer to “how” is an assertion that it is a **“mystery”** (on “mystery” cf. Rom 16:25-26; Eph 3:3:4-5, 9-10; Col 1 1:26-27; Rev 10:7; 1 Enoch 103.2; 104.10), **an act of God, albeit a logical necessity** for moving from one kingdom to another.

 Cf. 1 Thess 4:15-17

 \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

The concept of Christ’s resurrection and the eventual resurrection “of the Saints” is a neglected topic. We have viewed the basics of 1 Cor 15, but the idea of resurrection has many aspects about eschatology (study of end times) that we will not pursue. I have provided a document on the “final judgment” of the end times by my friend and colleague, Dr. David L. Turner (author of *Matthew* in the Baker Exegetical Commentary series). **SEE p. 236 for summary.**

In addition to Dr. Turner’s bibliography, here are some items focused on “resurrection” to add to your library.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus.*
 Paulist Press, 1973.
 Evans, C. F. *Resurrection and the New Testament*. SCM Press Ltd, 1970.

 Wright, N. T. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Fortress Press, 2003.

 **Resources for Thinking about Final Judgment**

Compiled by David L. Turner for GRTS classes, April 2011

*I compiled these resources to center my own thinking on the topic of final judgment. Perhaps they will be useful to others. Here are some key biblical texts (pp. 1-4), excerpts from representative confessions of faith (pp. 4-13), reflective thoughts (pp. 13-14), and sources for further study (p. 15). Final judgment is not the most welcoming of topics for Bible study, but perhaps for that very reason it is all the more important. I am convinced that our views of this topic unmask our views of biblical authority, of salvation in Christ, and of the very nature of God.*

**Biblical Texts**

*The following is simply a list of biblical texts, roughly in canonical order, which are especially relevant for understanding the biblical teaching on final judgment. Study of the main themes of these texts will lead to an authentic biblical theology of final judgment. Final judgment is mentioned in around 100 passages, found in 25 of the 27 NT books (every NT book except Philemon and 3 John).*

Isa 26:19 This “resurrection” is likely that of Israel in return from exile.
Ezek 37:12-14 This “resurrection” is also likely that of Israel in return from exile.
Dan 12:1-3 Resurrection leads either to everlasting life or to everlasting shame and disgrace.

Matt 3:7 John the Baptist warns of the coming wrath (Luke 3:7)
 3:10, 12 John warns of unquenchable fire (Luke 3:17)
 5:21-22, Jesus teaches about the danger of judgment in hell.
 5:29-30 Jesus teaches about the danger of punishment in hell.
 7:13 Jesus teaches about the broad road which leads to destruction.
 7:23, 27 Jesus banishes evildoers and speaks parabolically of a great fall.
 8:12 Many will experience outer darkness instead of the messianic feast.
 8:29 Demons are aware of a coming time of judgment.
 10:28 Disciples should fear God who can destroy body and soul in hell (Luke 12:5)
 11:22-24 Jesus warns of a coming day of judgment (Luke 10:14-15; 11:31-32)
 12:36-37 Jesus speaks of condemnation on the day of judgment (cf. 12:41-42)
 13:40-42 Jesus speaks of final judgment as a fiery furnace (cf. 13:50)
 16:27 Jesus speaks of the Son of Man’s final recompense of every person’s deeds.
 18:8-9 Jesus warns of eternal and fiery hell (cf. 18:35; Mark 9:43, 48).
 22:13 Jesus warns of outer darkness and gnashing of teeth.
 23:15, 33 Jesus speaks of “sons of hell” and the sentence of hell.
 25:30 Jesus speaks of outer darkness and gnashing of teeth.
 25:41, 46 Jesus commands “goats” to depart into eternal fire, punishment.

Mark 9:48 Unquenchable fire of hell

Luke 16:23 The rich man’s torment in hades

John 3:16ff. Jesus speaks of the danger of perishing in God’s condemning judgment.
 3:36 The wrath of God abides on unbelievers.
 5:24-29 Jesus speaks of a resurrection for life and judgment
 9:39 Jesus came into the world for judgment.
 11:24 Martha speaks of he resurrection on the last day.
 12:48 Jesus’ words will judge humans on the last day.
 15:6 Those who do not abide in Jesus (unfruitful branches) are burned.
 16:8ff. The Spirit’s ministry of conviction about judgment
 17:12 The son of perdition perishes.
 20:23 The disciples forgive or retain sins.

Acts 2:35 Peter cites Ps 110:1 in alluding to the humbling of God’s enemies
 3:19-26 Peter promises restoration and warns of consequences of unbelief
 8:22 Peter warns Simon that his money will be destroyed with him.
 10:42 Peter tells Cornelius that Jesus will judge all humans.
 17:31 Paul tells the Areopagites about repentance and final judgment by Jesus
 24:15-16 Paul speaks of a clear conscience and the resurrection of just and unjust
 24:25 Paul reasons with Felix about judgment to come

Rom 1:18 God’s wrath against those who suppress revelation in nature
 2:1-16 Final judgment of Jews (Torah-based) and Gentiles (“conscience”-based)
 3:5-6 God judges righteously.
 5:9 Believers are saved from the wrath of God
 9:22 Vessels of wrath prepared for destruction
 12:19 Human vengeance should defer to God’s judgment
 14:10-12 All humans will stand before the judgment seat of God.

1 Cor 3:13-15 Everyone’s works will be tested by fire.
 4:5 Christ will reveal the secrets of human hearts at his coming.
2 Cor 5:10 We will all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

Gal 1:8-9 Paul wishes that those who preach another gospel be accursed.
 5:19-21 Those who practice the deds of the flesh will not inherit God’s kingdom.
 6:6-9 Sowing to the flesh leads to corruption; sowing to the Spirit leads to eternal life.
Eph 5:6 Sinful behavior brings the wrath of God on unbelievers.
Phil 2:9-11 Universal acknowledgment of Christ’s Lordship
 3:9-11 Paul’s aspirations to be found in Christ at the resurrection
 3:18-19 Enemies of Christ whose end is destruction.
 4:3 Paul’s fellow workers’ names are in the book of life.
Col 3:5-6 The wrath of God will come because of sin.
 3:24-25 God will impartially reward and punish.
1 Thess 1:10 Believers delivered from coming wrath
 3:13 Prayer that believers may be established in holiness at Christ’s coming
 4:13ff. Believers comforted with Christ’s return
 5:1ff Day of the Lord brings wrath and destruction to unbelievers.
 5:23 Prayer for believers to be completely sanctified at Christ’s coming
2 Thess 1:6ff. God will repay persecutors with affliction, destruction, flaming fire.

 2:12 Jesus’ word will destroy the lawless one at his coming.

1 Tim 6:13ff. Jesus’ appearance motivates faithful ministry.
2 Tim 4:1-8 Jesus future judgment of living and dead motivates faithful ministry.
Tit 2:12-13 Jesus’ glorious appearance motivates godly living.

Heb 6:2 Resurrection and eternal judgment as foundational truths
 9:27-28 Humans appointed for judgment after death
 10:27-31 Prospect of judgment is terrifying to those who are in danger of falling away.
 11:35 Saints endured persecution to achieve a better resurrection.
 12:14 Without sanctification no one will see the Lord.
 12:23 God is the judge of all.
 12:29 God is a consuming fire.
 13:4 God will judge sexually immoral people.

Jas 2:13 merciless judgment for those who showed no mercy
 4:12 God the one lawgiver and judge is able to save and destroy.
 5:1-6 Rich are warned about storing up “treasure” for the last days.
 5:7-10 Uncomplaining patient endurance is needed until the coming of Christ the judge.

1 Pet 1:3-9 Final salvation is the reward for believers’ faith.
 4:4-6 Unbelievers will give an account to God who will judge the living and the dead.
 4:17-18 If judgment comes to believers first, how bad will it be for unbelievers?
2 Pet 1:10-11 Diligent endurance is needed for an abundant reward.
 2:4 Angels who sinned are cast into hell, reserved for final judgment.
 2:9 Unrighteous are kept under punishment for the day of judgment.
 3:4 Mockers deny Christ’s return as judge.
 3:7ff. Present earth is reserved for fiery judgment and destruction of the ungodly.

1 John 2:28 Abiding in Christ leads to confidence, not shame, at his coming.
 4:17 Confidence on the day of judgment
2 John 8 Doctrinal vigilance is related to receiving a full reward.
Jude 4 False teachers were previously marked for condemnation.
 6 Angels who sinned have been bound, reserved for final judgment.
 7 Sodom and Gomorrah undergo judgment of eternal fire.
 21, 24 Prospect of reward at Christ’s return

Rev (However it is interpreted, the entire book speaks of judgment and reward.)
 2:7 Overcomers promised reward. Cf. 2:11, 17, 26; 3:5, 12, 21
 6:10 Martyrs pray for God to judge those who dwell on the earth.
 6:12-17 Sixth seal brings the great day of God’s wrath to the earth.
 7:13-17 Martyrs are comforted by the Lamb.
 11:15-18 Christ begins to reign and judges the living and the dead.
 12:9ff. Satan is thrown down from heaven.
 14:7 The hour of God’s judgment has come.
 14:10 Beast worshippers drink the wine of God’s wrath.
 15:1 Seven last plagues finish the wrath of God.
 16:5-7 Saints confess God’s judgment to be true and righteous.
 16:9-11 Judgment leads to blasphemy, not purification and repentance.
 18:20 Saints are told to rejoice over God’s judgment of Babylon.
 19:2ff. Saints rejoice and praise God for judging Babylon.
 19:20 Beast and false prophet are thrown into lake of fire and brimstone.
 20:10 Satan thrown into lake of fire and brimstone
 20:14-15 Those not written in the book are thrown into lake of fire and brimstone.
 21:1-8 Destiny of believers is contrasted to that of those in lake of fire and brimstone.
 21:27 Only those in the book of life enter the new Jerusalem.
 22:12 Jesus rewards everyone for what he/she has done.
 22:15 Unbelievers are outside the New Jerusalem.

**Excerpts from Representative Confessions of Faith**

*As a Baptist with history in the Regular Baptist movement, I decided to do a quick tour of final judgment in the Baptist confessions which led up the present Cornerstone University Confession, working from the present Confession (currently under revision) back through history to 1689.  The London Baptist Confession of 1689 was a baptistic touch-up of the Westminster Confession (1647). Additional Baptist confessions are included in a following list of ancient and modern confessions in alphabetical order. The following excerpts have been edited: proof texts and formatting have been omitted.*

Cornerstone Confession, section one:

7. We believe in the personal return of the Lord Jesus Christ, the bodily resurrection and final judgment of the just and the unjust, the everlasting blessedness of the saved and the everlasting, conscious punishment of the lost.

The GARBC Articles of Faith

XX. The Righteous and the Wicked

We believe that there is a radical and essential difference between the righteous and the wicked; that only those who are justified by faith in our Lord Jesus Christ and sanctified by the Spirit of our God are truly righteous in His esteem; while all such as continue in impenitence and unbelief are in His sight wicked and under the curse; and this distinction holds among men both in and after death, in the everlasting felicity of the saved and the everlasting conscious suffering of the lost in the lake of fire.

The New Hampshire Confession (1833)

 17. Of the Righteous and the Wicked We believe that there is a radical and essential difference between the righteous and the wicked; that such only as through faith are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and sanctified by the Spirit of our God, are truly righteous in his esteem; while all such as continue in impenitence and unbelief are in his sight wicked, and under the curse; and this distinction holds among men both in and after death.

18. Of the World to Come We believe that the end of the world is approaching; that at the last day Christ will descend from heaven, and raise the dead from the grave to final retribution; that a solemn separation will then take place; that the wicked will be adjudged to endless punishment, and the righteous to endless joy; and that this judgment will fix forever the final state of men in heaven or hell, on principles of righteousness.

The Philadelphia Confession (1742)

Chapter 33: Of the State of Man after Death and Of the Resurrection of the Dead.

1. The bodies of men after death return to dust, and see corruption; but their souls, which neither die nor sleep, having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them. The souls of the righteous being then made perfect in holiness, are received into paradise, where they are with Christ, and behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell; where they remain in torment and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day; besides these two places, for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none.

2. At the last day, such of the saints as are found alive, shall not sleep, but be changed; and all the dead shall be raised up with the selfsame bodies, and none other; although with different qualities, which shall be united again to their souls forever.

3. The bodies of the unjust shall, by the power of Christ, be raised to dishonour; the bodies of the just, by his Spirit, unto honour, and be made conformable to his own glorious body.

Chapter 34: Of the Last Judgment

1. God hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness, by Jesus Christ; to whom all power and judgment is given of the Father; in which day, not only the apostate angels shall be judged, but likewise all persons that have lived upon the earth shall appear before the tribunal of Christ, to give an account of their thoughts, words, and deeds, and to receive according to what they have done in the body, whether good or evil.

2. The end of God's appointing this day, is for the manifestation of the glory of his mercy, in the eternal salvation of the elect; and of his justice, in the eternal damnation of the reprobate, who are wicked and disobedient; for then shall the righteous go into everlasting life, and receive that fullness of joy and glory with everlasting rewards, in the presence of the Lord; but the wicked, who know not God, and obey not the gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast aside into everlasting torments, and punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.

3. As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded that there shall be a day of judgment, both to deter all men from sin, and for the greater consolation of the godly in their adversity, so will he have the day unknown to men, that they may shake off all carnal security, and be always watchful, because they know not at what hour the Lord will come, and may ever be prepared to say, Come Lord Jesus; come quickly. Amen.

The (Second) London Confession (1689)

Chapter 31: Of the state of man after death, and of the resurrection of the dead

1. The bodies of men after death return to dust, and see corruption; but their souls, which neither die nor sleep, having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them. The souls of the righteous being then made perfect in holiness, are received into paradise, where they are with Christ, and behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell; where they remain in torment and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day; besides these two places, for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none.

2. At the last day, such of the saints as are found alive, shall not sleep, but be changed; and all the dead shall be raised up with the selfsame bodies, and none other; although with different qualities, which shall be united again to their souls forever.

3. The bodies of the unjust shall, by the power of Christ, be raised to dishonour; the bodies of the just, by his Spirit, unto honour, and be made conformable to his own glorious body.

Chapter 32: Of the Last Judgment

1. God has appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness, by Jesus Christ; to whom all power and judgment is given of the Father; in which day, not only the apostate angels shall be judged, but likewise all persons that have lived upon the earth shall appear before the tribunal of Christ, to give an account of their thoughts, words, and deeds, and to receive according to what they have done in the body, whether good or evil. Paragraph 2. The end of God's appointing this day, is for the manifestation of the glory of his mercy, in the eternal salvation of the elect; and of his justice, in the eternal damnation of the reprobate, who are wicked and disobedient; for then shall the righteous go into everlasting life, and receive that fulness of joy and glory with everlasting rewards, in the presence of the Lord; but the wicked, who do not know God, and do not obey the gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast aside into everlasting torments, and punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.

2. The end of God's appointing this day is for the manifestation of the glory of His mercy in the eternal salvation of the elect, and also His justice, in the eternal damnation of the reprobate, who are wicked and disobedient. . . .

3. As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded that there shall be a day of judgment, both to deter all men from sin, and for the greater consolation of the godly in their adversity, so will he have the day unknown to men, that they may shake off all carnal security, and be always watchful, because they know not at what hour the Lord will come, and may ever be prepared to say, Come Lord Jesus; come quickly.  Amen.

**Additional Confessions, ancient and modern, in alphabetical order**

The Apostles’ Creed (Eighth Century CE?)

 . . . He ascended to heaven and is seated at the right hand of God the Father almighty. From there he will come to judge the living and the dead. . . .

The Assemblies of God (Fundamental Truths)

15. The Final Judgment: There will be a final judgment in which the wicked dead will be raised and judged according to their works. Whosoever is not found written in the Book of Life, together with the devil and his angels, the beast and the false prophet, will be consigned to the everlasting punishment in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.

The Athanasian Creed (Sixth Century CE?)

Whoever desires to be saved should above all hold to the catholic faith. Anyone who does not keep it whole and unbroken will doubtless perish eternally. . .

He suffered for our salvation; he descended to hell; he arose from the dead; he ascended to heaven; he is seated at the Father's right hand; from there he will come to judge the living and the dead. At his coming all people will arise bodily and give an accounting of their own deeds. Those who have done good will enter eternal life, and those who have done evil will enter eternal fire. This is the catholic faith: one cannot be saved without believing it firmly and faithfully.

Augsburg Confession (Lutheran), 1530:

Article XVII: Of Christ's Return to Judgment: 1]Also they teach that at the consummation of the world Christ will appear for judgment, and 2] will raise up all the dead; He will give to the godly and elect eternal life and everlasting joys, 3] but ungodly men and the devils He will condemn to be tormented without end.

Belgic Confession (1561)

Therefore, with good reason the thought of this judgment is horrible and dreadful to wicked and evil people.  But it is very pleasant and a great comfort to the righteous and elect, since their total redemption will then be accomplished.  They will then receive the fruits of their labor and of the trouble they have suffered; their innocence will be openly recognized by all; and they will see the terrible vengeance that God will bring on the evil ones who tyrannized, oppressed, and tormented them in this world.

The evil ones will be convicted by the witness of their own consciences, and shall be made immortal -- but only to be tormented in the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels.

In contrast, the faithful and elect will be crowned with glory and honor.  The Son of God will "confess their names" before God his Father and the holy and elect angels; all tears will be "wiped from their eyes"; and their cause -- at present condemned as heretical and evil by many judges and civil officers -- will be acknowledged as the "cause of the Son of God." And as a gracious reward the Lord will make them possess a glory such as the heart of man could never imagine. So we look forward to that great day with longing in order to enjoy fully the promises of God in Christ Jesus, our Lord.

The Brethren Church (Ashland, OH), Centennial Statement, 1984

Last Things

By the sending of His Son, God inaugurated the last days. Therefore the church waits eagerly for the consummation of the divine plan in Christ. Prior to that, the human body at death returns to the dust from which it came. The soul of the Christian goes immediately to be with the Lord, while the souls of the unsaved enter into torment. The climax of God's plan will include the personal, visible return of Jesus Christ from heaven as King of kings and Lord of lords; the bodily resurrection and judgment of believers unto eternal life; the bodily resurrection and judgment of the wicked unto eternal punishment; and a new heaven and a new earth in which righteousness dwells, where the saved will live eternally with the Lord. The Bible does not focus so much on the details and order of final events as on how believers are to live in light of these things.

Christian And Missionary Alliance

There shall be a bodily resurrection of the just and of the unjust; for the former, a resurrection unto life; for the latter, a resurrection unto judgment.

Church of the Nazarene

20. We believe in the resurrection of the dead, that the bodies both of the just and of the unjust shall be raised to life and united with their spirits—“they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.”

21. We believe in future judgment in which every person shall appear before God to be judged according to his or her deeds in this life.

22. We believe that glorious and everlasting life is assured to all who savingly believe in, and obediently follow, Jesus Christ our Lord; and that the finally impenitent shall suffer
eternally in hell.

Converge Worldwide (Baptist General Conference)

12. The Last Things:We believe in the personal and visible return of the Lord Jesus Christ to earth and the establishment of His kingdom. We believe in the resurrection of the body, the final judgment, the eternal felicity of the righteous, and the endless suffering of the wicked.

Evangelical Free Church of America

Response and Eternal Destiny10. We believe that God commands everyone everywhere to believe the gospel by turning to Him in repentance and receiving the Lord Jesus Christ. We believe that God will raise the dead bodily and judge the world, assigning the unbeliever to condemnation and eternal conscious punishment and the believer to eternal blessedness and joy with the Lord in the new heaven and the new earth, to the praise of His glorious grace. Amen.

Evangelical United Brethren/United Methodist Church: The Confession of Faith

Article XII—The Judgment and the Future State- We believe all men stand under the righteous judgment of Jesus Christ, both now and in the last day. We believe in the resurrection of the dead; the righteous to life eternal and the wicked to endless condemnation.

Fellowship of Grace Brethren Churches

12. FUTURE LIFE. The conscious existence of the dead, . . . the resurrection of the body (John 5:28-29), the judgment and reward of believers . . ., the judgment and condemnation of unbelievers . . . , the eternal life of the saved . . . ,and the eternal punishment of the lost.

The Free Methodist Church of North America

XIX. Resurrection. A/128. There will be a bodily resurrection from the dead of both the just and the unjust, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation. . . .

XXI. Final Destiny. A/130. Our eternal destiny is determined by God's grace and our response, not by arbitrary decrees of God. For those who trust Him and obediently follow Jesus as Savior and Lord, there is a heaven of eternal glory and the blessedness of Christ's presence. But for the finally impenitent there is a hell of eternal suffering and of separation from God.

Full Gospel Fellowship of Churches and Ministers

13. We believe in a literal heaven and a literal hell, eternal reward and judgment.

Independent Fundamental Churches of America

(16) The Eternal State

a. We believe in the bodily resurrection of all men, the saved to eternal life, and the unsaved to judgment and everlasting punishment.

b. We believe that the souls of the redeemed are, at death, absent from the body and present with the Lord, where in conscious bliss they await the first resurrection, when spirit, soul and body are reunited to be glorified forever with the Lord.

c. We believe that the souls of unbelievers remain, after death, in conscious misery until the second resurrection, when with soul and body reunited they shall appear at the Great White Throne Judgment, and shall be cast into the Lake of Fire, not to be annihilated, but to suffer everlasting conscious punishment.

International Church of the Fourfold Gospel

Judgment

We believe that everyone will stand before the judgment seat of Christ. Born-again believers will be sent to a place of everlasting life, and nonbelievers will be sent to a place of everlasting punishment.

Heaven

We believe that heaven is the habitation of the living God and the eternal home of born-again believers.

Hell

We believe that hell is a place of darkness, deep sorrow and unquenchable fire, which was not prepared for man but for the devil and his angels; it will become the place of eternal separation from God for all who reject Christ as Savior.

Mennonite Confession of faith, 1963

Article 20. The Final Consummation

We believe that in addition to the physical order with which our senses are related, there also exists an eternal spiritual order, the realm of God, of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, of the angels, and of the church triumphant. We believe that at death the righteous enter at once into conscious joy and fellowship with Christ, while the wicked are in a state of conscious suffering. . . . In His triumphant Second Coming Christ will judge Satan, and usher in the consummation of all things. His coming will introduce the resurrection, the transformation of the living saints, the judgment of the just and the unjust, and the fulfillment of His glorious reign. He will deliver the kingdom to God the Father, cleanse the world by fire, create new heavens and a new earth, consign unbelievers to eternal punishment, and usher His children into the eternal bliss of the world to come.

Messianic Jewish Alliance of America

RESURRECTION AND JUDGMENT We believe in the resurrection of both the redeemed and the lost: the former to everlasting life and the latter to eternal separation from God, a state of everlasting punishment.

National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) Statement of Faith

We believe in the resurrection of both the saved and the lost; they that are saved unto the resurrection of life and they that are lost unto the resurrection of damnation.

National Baptist Convention, USA

XVII. RIGHTEOUS AND WICKED.

We believe the Scriptures teach that there is a radical and essential difference between the righteous and the wicked; that such only as through faith are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and sanctified by the Spirit of our God, are truly righteous in his esteem; while all such as continue in impenitence and unbelief are in his sight wicked, and under the curse; and this distinction holds among men both in and after death.

XVIII. THE WORLD TO COME.

We believe the Scriptures teach that the end of the world is approaching; that at the last day, Christ will descend from heaven, and raise the dead from the grave for final retribution; that a solemn separation will then take place; that the wicked will be adjudged to endless punishment, and the righteous to endless joy; and that this judgment will fix forever the final state of men in heaven or hell, on principles of righteousness.

Nicene Creed (325 CE)

 . . . He ascended to heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come again with glory to judge the living and the dead. His kingdom will never end. . . .

Roman Catholic Church: Catechism (2nd ed. 1997)

1022 Each man receives his eternal retribution in his immortal soul at the very moment of his death, in a particular judgment that refers his life to Christ: either entrance into the blessedness of heaven-through a purification or immediately, or immediate and everlasting damnation. . . .

1033 We cannot be united with God unless we freely choose to love him. But we cannot love God if we sin gravely against him, against our neighbor or against ourselves. . . . To die in mortal sin without repenting and accepting God's merciful love means remaining separated from him for ever by our own free choice. This state of definitive self-exclusion from communion with God and the blessed is called "hell."

1034 Jesus often speaks of "Gehenna" of "the unquenchable fire" reserved for those who to the end of their lives refuse to believe and be converted, where both soul and body can be lost. . . .

1035 The teaching of the Church affirms the existence of hell and its eternity. Immediately after death the souls of those who die in a state of mortal sin descend into hell, where they suffer the punishments of hell, "eternal fire." The chief punishment of hell is eternal separation from God, in whom alone man can possess the life and happiness for which he was created and for which he longs.

1041 The message of the Last Judgment calls men to conversion while God is still giving them "the acceptable time, . . . the day of salvation." It inspires a holy fear of God and commits them to the justice of the Kingdom of God. It proclaims the "blessed hope" of the Lord's return, when he will come "to be glorified in his saints, and to be marveled at in all who have believed."

Southern Baptist Church: Baptist Faith and Message (1925)

XV. The Righteous and the Wicked

There is a radical and essential difference between the righteous and wicked. Those only who are justified through the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and sanctified by the Holy Spirit are truly righteous in his sight. Those who continue in impenitence and unbelief are in his sight wicked and are under condemnation. This distinction between the righteous and the wicked holds in and after death, and will be made manifest at the judgment when final and everlasting awards are made to all men.

Southern Baptist Church: Baptist Faith and Message (1963, 2000)

X. Last Things

God, in His own time and in His own way, will bring the world to its appropriate end. According to His promise, Jesus Christ will return personally and visibly in glory to the earth; the dead will be raised; and Christ will judge all men in righteousness. The unrighteous will be consigned to Hell, the place of everlasting punishment. The righteous in their resurrected and glorified bodies will receive their reward and will dwell forever in Heaven with the Lord.

Vineyard USA

The Kingdom of God and the Final Judgment

We believe that God’s kingdom has come in the ministry of ourLord Jesus Christ, that it continues tocome in the ministry of the Spirit through the Church, and that it will be consummated in the glorious, visible and triumphant appearing of Christ–His return to the earth as King. After Christ returns to reign, He will bring about the final defeat of Satan and all of his minions and works, the resurrection of the dead, the final judgment and the eternal blessing of the righteous and eternal conscious punishment of the wicked.

The Wesleyan Church

19. The Resurrection of the Dead: We believe in the bodily resurrection from the dead of all people—of the just unto the resurrection of life, and of the unjust unto the resurrection of damnation. The resurrection of Christ is the guarantee of the resurrection which will occur at Christ's Second Coming. The raised body will be a spiritual body, but the person will be whole and identifiable.

20.The Judgment of All Persons: We believe that the Scriptures reveal God as the Judge of all and the acts of His judgment are based on His omniscience and eternal justice. His administration of judgment will culminate in the final meeting of all persons before His throne of great majesty and power, where records will be examined and final rewards and punishments will be administered.

21. Destiny:We believe that the Scriptures clearly teach that there is a conscious personal existence after death. The final destiny of each person is determined by God's grace and that person's response, evidenced inevitably by a moral character which results from that individual's personal and volitional choices and not from any arbitrary decree of God. Heaven with its eternal glory and the blessedness of Christ's presence is the final abode of those who choose the salvation which God provides through Jesus Christ, but hell with its everlasting misery and separation from God is the final abode of those who neglect this great salvation.

Westminster Confession of Faith Chapter 33 (1647)

1. God hath appointed a day, wherein He will judge the world, in righteousness, by Jesus Christ, to whom all power and judgment is given of the Father. In which day, not only the apostate angels shall be judged, but likewise all persons that have lived upon earth shall appear before the tribunal of Christ, to give an account of their thoughts, words, and deeds; and to receive according to what they have done in the body, whether good or evil.

2. The end of God's appointing this day is for the manifestation of the glory of His mercy, in the eternal salvation of the elect; and of His justice, in the damnation of the reprobate, who are wicked and disobedient. For then shall the righteous go into everlasting life, and receive that fullness of joy and refreshing, which shall come from the presence of the Lord: but the wicked, who know not God, and obey not the Gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast into eternal torments, and be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power.

3. As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded that there shall be a day of judgment, both to deter all men from sin; and for the greater consolation of the godly in their adversity: so will He have that day unknown to men, that they may shake off all carnal security, and be always watchful, because they know not at what hour the Lord will come; and may be ever prepared to say, Come Lord Jesus, come quickly. Amen.

Westminster Larger Catechism (1648)

Question 89: What shall be done to the wicked at the day of judgment?

Answer: At the day of judgment, the wicked shall be set on Christ's left hand, and, upon clear evidence, and full conviction of their own consciences, shall have the fearful but just sentence of condemnation pronounced against them; and thereupon shall be cast out from the favorable presence of God, and the glorious fellowship with Christ, his saints, and all his holy angels, into hell, to be punished with unspeakable torments, both of body and soul, with the devil and his angels forever.

Question 90: What shall be done to the righteous at the day of judgment?

Answer: At the day of judgment, the righteous, being caught up to Christ in the clouds, shall be set on his right hand, and there openly acknowledged and acquitted, shall join with him in the judging of reprobate angels and men, and shall be received into heaven, where they shall be fully and forever freed from all sin and misery; filled with inconceivable joys, made perfectly holy and happy both in body and soul, in the company of innumerable saints and holy angels, but especially in the immediate vision and fruition of God the Father, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, to all eternity. And this is the perfect and full communion, which the members of the invisible church shall enjoy with Christ in glory, at the resurrection and day of judgment.

World Evangelical Alliance

The resurrection of both the saved and the lost; they that are saved unto the resurrection of life, they that are lost unto the resurrection of damnation.

**Reflections on the Implications of the Biblical Doctrine of Final Judgment**

*The following points are based on a process in which several GRTS/CU faculty worked through issues related to heaven, hell, and final judgment. However, this summary of key ideas from that process is solely my work.*

• Hell is a real and everlasting experience for those who have rejected God’s gracious offer of salvation from sin and its consequences. God does not delight in the lost going to hell, but is grieved, as we should also be, that anyone would reject his merciful plan of salvation through Jesus Christ.

***•*** Scripture does not teach that heaven and hell are experienced during our present lives on earth. Although there is a sense in which present human experience can be "heavenly" or “hellish,” present human experiences do not compare to the glory of full restoration to fellowship with God in the new heavens and new earth, or to the grim reality of the desperate hopelessness of hell.

***•*** God is love in its fullest and most profound sense. God is also many other things, including just, holy, merciful, and good. He is not reducible to any of his individual attributes. Rather, all his attributes exist together in equal priority and work in perfect harmony in all his plan and dealings with humankind. God’s righteous justice in dealing with the unrepentant is in no way comparable to the capricious anger of other so-called gods.

***•*** Our sin and sinful ways have deeply offended God, yet he has mercifully offered forgiveness and new life to us through Christ's life, death and resurrection. Scripture uses several images to portray God’s reconciling sinners to himself through Jesus. He took the place of sinners as a willing, innocent sacrifice. His blood makes peace between enemies. In his resurrection he has victoriously conquered sin, death and the devil. On the cross he endured the just wrath of God on our behalf and satisfied God’s justice. He frees humans from their slavery to sin. His life and death show his followers how to live in a way which pleases God.

***•*** God’s reconciliation through Christ is effective only when it is appropriated by individuals who hear the gospel and turn to God in repentance and faith. God calls the church to words and works which bring to all people the liberating message of forgiveness and new life in Christ. The church calls people to turn to God in a faith which follows the teaching and example of Jesus. This gospel of Jesus provides believers abundant life now and for all eternity. It also clearly warns unbelievers of the present ravages of sin as well its everlasting consequences.

***•*** There is no evidence in Scripture for the idea that hell has a pruning or correcting influence on those who are there. Neither is there biblical evidence that those who are justly sent to hell will be given opportunities for repentance and salvation. The sobering biblical teaching of the finality of hell underlines the urgency of the church’s mission of calling people to immediate repentance.

***•*** Human beings will be held accountable for the revelation they have received, whether that revelation comes from their own conscience, from nature, or from Scripture. God’s judgment of those who have never heard the gospel will be in perfect harmony with his attributes of grace, justice, love, holiness, mercy, and righteousness. God’s exercise of these attributes in final judgment will resound to his glory, goodness, justice, and wisdom.

***•*** The goal of Christian mission is not to make God’s wise plan of salvation through Jesus Christ palatable to those who hear it. Although Christians must present the message of Jesus in a culturally appropriate manner, the message itself must not be changed to avoid potential offense. The sobering reality of a final judgment where all humans will give an account to God is an altogether appropriate motivation for faith in Jesus Christ and for a life of obedience to his teaching.

• The reality of final judgment and our accountability to God convinces us that we should more faithfully attend to the means of grace which he has provided for our growth in the Christian life. This reality also forcefully reminds us that we should be more compassionate toward unbelievers and more active in reaching out to them. Views of God’s judgment which compromise a biblical view of the final state of human beings, both believers and unbelievers, diminish the urgency of believers living for God and warning unbelievers of the unspeakable danger they face. Reflection on the biblical teaching of final judgment leads us rededicate our lives and resources to God and the furtherance of the gospel of Jesus Christ.
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IV. Paul’s Response to a Written communiqué from Corinth (7:1-16:12; cf. 7:1)
 A. Paul’s Response to Issues of Sex and Marriage (7:1-40)
 B. Paul's Response to the Question of Food Sacrificed to Idols (8:1-11:1)
 C. Paul's Response to the questions of Public Worship (11:2-34)
 D. Paul's Response to the Questions Concerning Spiritual Gifts (12:1-14:40).
 E. Paul's Response to Questions Concerning the Doctrine of Resurrection (15:1-
 58)

**F. Paul's response to two Questions: Concerning the Collection of Money for the church in Jerusalem (16:1-11) and Apollos (16:12) “now concerning”/** Περὶ δὲ

 **1. Concerning the Collection (16:1-11)**

 1a. A **Collection** that Paul Was Soliciting from his Gentile Churches for the “Jewish Christian poor in Jerusalem (cf. Gal 2:10;
 2 Cor 8-9; Rom 15:24-33; Acts 24:17)” (Talbert, 131). **16:1-4**

 The return to the structural indicator "now concerning" (cf. 7:1, 25; 8:1, 12:1; cf.
 16:12) indicates that Paul is still answering the Corinthians' questions.

This offering relates to Paul’s passion for the Saints in Jerusalem who were suffering hardships. The Greek term used for “collection” was common for soliciting money for sacred purposes. Garland notes that this is the only time that Paul uses this term in reference to the Jerusalem collection project. He thinks that may indicate that the Corinthians used it and he picked it up from them. The Jerusalem project is a recurring theme with Paul (Cf. 2 Cor 8:4; 9:1, 12; Gal 2:10; Acts). See Garland’s interesting chart portraying Paul’s imaging of the Jerusalem project (p. 763).

 This ministry of the Gentile Church to Jerusalem probably signified several things to Paul (cf. Rom 15:25-28; Bruce, NCB, in.loc.).

* An acknowledgement of the Gentile church's spiritual debt to their Jewish origins;
* A token of the genuine faith of the Gentile church;
* A sort of "palm branch" in light of occasional tensions between the two groups.

 16:2-4 reflects how Paul viewed doing a collection project:

* The “first day of the week” (Sunday to us; Acts 20:7) is clearly signaled as the time when Christians formally gather. His encouragement about giving here is only about the Jerusalem project. Taking up repeated offerings for this purpose will help it grow.
* Note that Paul makes no appeal to a “standard” like tithing but says
	+ “whatever one could afford” (Zerwick).
	+ The NRSV, “whatever extra you earn.”
	+ NIV2011, “you should set aside a sum of money in keeping with your income, saving it up”
* Paul’s instructions about HOW to give levels everyone to an across-the-board standard so that rich and poor may participate. The implication is reasonable that giving relates to “after” necessities are cared for. There is no manipulations nor guilt implications, each does their giving before God. “Paul asks them to give out of their abundance, not sacrificially….” (Garland, 754)
* Paul distances himself from control and caretaking in terms of the gift while remaining connected (16:3-4)

This is an appropriate place to note that the concept of “tithe” in the Bible relates to Israel. Israel was both a religious AND civil entity. The tithe was a tax to cover many domains of religious and civil life. The NT never raises the issue of tithe as a standard for giving. One might observe a useful analogical relationship, but that risks being manipulative and abusive use of the Bible.

 2a. Paul’s entourage **travel plans** in relation to the offering (**16:5-
 11**).

 1b. Paul’s travels (16:5-9)

There is a tendency, especially after the study of a long and challenging book, to dismiss the final words too quickly. Paul’s rehearsal of his travel plans provides us with a number of insights into how the earliest “missionary” ministries operated.

* The earliest missionary (for lack of a better term) projects were always itinerate (resident leadership emerged from the founded congregations).
* Missionaries were dominantly dependent upon the places to which they ministered for their physical and financial needs (albeit with Paul, some churches seemed to support his travels generally). That is, their “support” was raised in the midst of their ministry and there was no “salary” above expenses. I would note that all of this is descriptive and not prescriptive. There were also variations…Paul was “single”; Peter took a wife around as well; there was usually an entourage of people travelling with Paul.
* There are numerous passages that give us insight into the travels of these workers (Acts 15:3; Rom 15:24; Titus 3:13; 3 John 6; 2 Cor 1:16; cf. 1 Macc. 12:4, “And the Romans gave them letters to the people in every place, asking them to provide for the envoys safe conduct to the land of Judah.”)
* 1 Cor 16:6, “so that you may send me on my way.” 3 John is my favorite window into the early work of itinerate ministers. After Paul’s death, the Apostle John managed the Churches of Asia Minor (early on, out of Ephesus and probably with the help of Timothy). 3 John is a window into how itinerate work happened in his day.
* The Roman “patronage” system also served the Christian mission (cf. 16:15 and Winter, *After*, Chapter 9).

 2b. Timothy’s status and travel (16:10-11)

 Paul repeated in short space “protects” Timothy:

* “see that he has nothing to fear” (?? May relate to how intimidating Corinth could be. 1 Cor 4:18-19; 2 Cor 10:10; 11:6, 7, 29; 12:11, 16, 21).
* “let no one despise him”; Timothy does not seem to have a strong personality (1 Tim 4:12; 2 Tim 1:7; 2:1; 2:3).
* “Send him on his way in peace”

 **2. Concerning (*peri de*) Apollos (16:12)**

Paul’s statement here is interesting. Apollos was obviously not part of Paul’s managed entourage. We do not know much about him, but he was “his own man” and approved by Paul as a worthy minister ‘anyway’. It is good to know that Paul didn’t always get his way and that he could handle that issue!

**V. Paul’s Epistolary Closing…Exhortations (16:13-24)**

1. **A Closing Exhortation/Admonition (“parenesis”) (16:13-18)**
2. A general exhortation (16:13-14)
* To be alert, “watch” is a verb used (21xs) for future perspective and eschatological alertness (Matt 24:42; 25:13; 26:38; 26:40 ,41; Mark 13:34, 35, 37; 14:34; 14:37, 38; Luke 12:37 Acts 20:31; Col 4:2; 1 Thess 5:6, 10; 1 Peter 5:8; Rev 3:2; 16:15).
* Standing fast in the faith, being courageous and strong provide boundaries to worldly practice.
1. A commendation to honor Corinthian Christian “workers” (16:15-18)

 Paul commends several of the Corinthian workers who were valuable in
 ministry.

Stephanas’ household seems to be a major “patron” to the Church at Corinth. Winter notes that Patrons are usually motivated to foster “honor” for themselves by doing good. In Paul’s statement, Stephanas did the reverse, he gave the community the honor and improved their status (16:17-18).

1. **Paul’s Epistolary Closing…Final Greetings (16:19-24)**
2. The Existing Network of Churches Send Greetings (16:19-20)

Paul wrote 1 Corinthians from Ephesus. At that time, Ephesus was the capital of the Roman province of Asia. The churches of Asia (16:19) covers a pretty large spectrum. Ephesus, Colossae, Hierqpolis, Laodicea and probably the other churches of Rev 1:11. It is also

interesting, that in the latter decades of the First Century, the Apostle John was the Overseer of the churches of Asia (see especially 2 and 3 John). John lived in Ephesus and Timothy was probably there after Paul’s death in the mid 50s.

Aquila and Prisca were known to Roman Corinth since they were prominent converts of Paul while in Corinth (Acts 18:2-3). They may have been patrons to the Corinthian church at one time (Rom 16:5). They became part of Paul’s entourage of ministry (Rom 16:3-4).

Greeting one another with a kiss was a common custom at that time. Probably something like the European custom today. It is descriptive. A good hand shake is equivalent.

1. Paul’s Authenticating Signature (16:21; cf. Gal 5:11ff.; Phlm 19; Col 4:18; 2 Thess 3:17)

Using an “amanuensis” was common practice in Paul’s day. He would dictate the letter, probably have it read back and perhaps making some adjustments, and then he would sign the final draft or add a brief statement at the end.

1. Paul’s Serious (and surprising?) Anathema and “Maranatha” (16:22; cf. 12:1-3; cf. 2 Thess 3:14-15)

The closing Anathema / Maranatha (“our Lord come”) is unique to 1 Corinthians, although one could compare the opening to Galatians (1:8-9)! Anathema constitutes a NT “imprecation.” Maranatha is an Aramaic term, a common language in First Century Palestine. Fitzmyer claims Paul prayed in Aramaic, possibly in correlation with Jesus use of Aramaic in his earthly life (Mark 14:36; cf. Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15). Jesus and the Apostles were well versed in Aramaic and Greek and probably Hebrew. There are historical documents that evidence these languages in Roman Palestine and the use of Latin as well for official Roman business.

1. Paul’s Closing Wishes (16:23-24):

Jesus’s grace be with you.

Paul’s love (covenant loyalty) is assured.

 1 Cor is the only Pauline epistle where he speaks of his “love”
 for the recipients.

 \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

Congratulations for working through these lectures on 1 Corinthians. While the hours and notes may seem like a lot, the professor is painfully aware of how much this series is merely an Introduction to this rich New Testament epistle.

The current professor, Dr. Gary T. Meadors, would greatly appreciate your evaluation of learning in terms of these lectures/notes. Please reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of the experience provided to you and send Dr. Meadors an email of your thoughts. The email is on the first Note Pack in the series.

You will note that this “ladder” bears a philosophical similarity to the “three levels” model. You begin with a specific example that is relatively direct and move to its later application. While it seems simple with a NT counterpart text, *it is more challenging when there is no “ending text” in the canon*. This “ladder of abstraction” works in a setting where you have an inter-textual base, but what about moving from texts that have no “completion” in Scripture, e.g. slavery or euthanasia? It seems that this paradigm has a more limited use.

*Conclusion*

Gaining an understanding of these three paradigms can assist you when you are dealing with issues that offer multiple views.

* You merely return to the text.
* You determine as much as possible the biblical author’s original intention.
* You grapple with the agenda oriented nature of the theological encyclopedia in the tools you utilize.
* You locate your text/s in relation to the three levels.
* You research and validate alternative views on your text.
* You develop your best lines of reason from text/s to interpretation and application.
* You live with your less-than-inspired interpretation with a good dose of humility in this life.

This is not light work. But it is rewarding to the person who stays the course and valuable for the parishioners who benefit from the explanation.

1. This primer is written from the conviction that one cannot understand theological views without understanding theological method. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A good illustration of this is Darrell Bock’s article that reflects on theological method and the past era of controversy between John Walvoord and George Eldon Ladd. The Ladd and Walvoord wars were driven by a lack of understanding (mainly Walvoord’s) of theological method and hermeneutics. See Darrell L. Bock, “Why I am a Dispensationalist with a small ‘d’.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 41.3 (1998):383-396. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Many individuals feel overwhelmed when they try to study these large paradigms of interpretation and often feel that real understanding will never happen. So some turn away from the hard work of the text. However, this should be an expected perception *because* one never understands any part of a paradigm until they understand the whole paradigm (e.g. the book of Revelation). Understanding the whole requires more reading, thinking and plain old hard work than most Christians are willing to do. I do not think that any person can grasp large paradigms with understanding and conviction—be it the eschatological issues or the bible on divorce and remarriage, or whatever—without working through a couple thousand pages of reading and studying on the topic. This, obviously, is the task of leadership not the laity. The Bible implies that this is why God ordained leaders in the church. My life verse is 2 Peter 3:16. In this text Peter refers to Paul saying, “… His [Paul’s] letters contain some things that are hard to understand….”. If the apostle Peter had a problem understanding the Bible, who are we to think we should not struggle with texts?! [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 1 [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
5. 2 [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
6. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)