

Dr. Gary Meadors, 1 Corinthians, Lecture 14, Paul's Response to Certain Oral Reports/Rumors, 1 Corinthians 5:1-6:20

© 2024 Gary Meadors and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Gary Meadors in his teaching on the book of 1 Corinthians. This is lecture 14, Paul's Response to Certain Oral Reports/Rumors, 1 Corinthians 5:1-6:20.

Welcome to lecture number 14 in our journey through 1 Corinthians.

We've looked at chapters 1 through 4, and over the next couple of sessions, we're going to be looking at chapters 5 and 6. As you'll remember from our introduction, 1 to 4 was based off of 1:11, a report from Chloe's household to Paul concerning issues that were going on. Chapters 5 and 6 are based on 5:1 that there are certain rumors about behavior at Corinth that are related particularly to sexuality and to courts. Later, in chapter 7:1 and following, Paul responds to things that were written to him by the Corinthians.

You should have notepad number 8 available to use today. And we'll be looking at chapter 5 today, hopefully doing the entire chapter. We'll see how things go as we get into this.

In terms of the summary of chapters 5 and 6, there is a unit, as we've mentioned, responding to the oral reports that are mentioned in 5:1. As I've mentioned to you in the past, it's always good to read Garland's summaries at the beginning of sections. He has a fine synthesis for you of what's going on in the coming chapters. In relation to the sexual issues that come up, particularly in the first part of chapter 5, there are, outside the Bible, references that point out that incest and that's what we're dealing with in 1 Corinthians 5, that incest was not acceptable in the Greco-Roman world.

Plutarch, who was a major writer, has a writing called *Moralia*, and he condemns incest as a lawless act. Josephus, who lived from about 37 to 100, is a very, very important figure when you study the New Testament. Josephus was a contemporary in the aftermath of Jesus and the apostles.

While he was a child, being born in 37, by the 50s, when the apostles were active, so was Josephus. Josephus, we do not know everything we'd like to know about Josephus. He could have been a military person.

He could have been a politician. Whatever it was, he had power. He was very involved at about the time of the Great War in 66 to 70.

We can't go into the details about this. His countrymen didn't like the way he related to Rome. Rome took him as his caretaker and took him back to Rome, where he wrote many works to present the Jewish people to the world.

He was very Jewish. He was never a Christian, but he was extremely proud of his heritage. Here's what Josephus has to say in Antiquities.

On page 66, you'll see this, and I'm going to read it to you. As for adultery, Moses forbade it entirely, 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. By the way, he says he's representing Moses, and to a great extent, he is, but when he says both to cities and families, he's let the cat out of the bag a little bit here.

Josephus was a Greco-Roman. He was very active during the time of these Roman colonies, and we've already talked about the issue of the city being the center of the Roman colonies. Bruce Winter's book, *Seek the Welfare of the City*, is a very important insight into the fact that their culture, their cultural norm, centered around cities and the structures within those cities of people.

So, Josephus is reflecting a little bit of his own times when he says that. The cities and families that children should be known to be genuine. He both abhorred men's lying with their mothers as one of the greatest crimes and the like for lying with the father's wife.

Now, Josephus certainly was putting this out before he knew anything about 1 Corinthians 5, if he ever knew anything about it. And with aunts and sisters and sons' wives, as all instances of abominable wickedness, according to Josephus. A lot of this has to do with the sex act, which was, of course, the sharing of seminal fluids, and it was incest that those fluids be shared among family members.

It's a very important issue within Judaism. If you've ever wondered why it is that two become one flesh, according to the biblical statement. When people get married, they become one flesh.

Well, one flesh in that context is a metaphor for being a relative. They're kinfolk. When you get married, you create a kinship with your spouse, and that is extremely protected within the Bible.

Josephus also forbade a man, or he says Moses, representing Moses' teaching, forbade a man to lie with his wife when she was defiled by her natural purgation. Once again, he's claiming Moses said these things, and some things Moses may have said, some things he may not have. Josephus is reflecting on his own time and space as well.

And not to come near brute beasts, no bestiality, nor to approve of the lying with a male, no homosexuality, which was to hunt after unlawful pleasures on account of beauty. To those who were guilty of such insolent behavior, he, representing Moses again but really representing the Jewish teaching of his time, ordained death as their punishment. So, both inside and outside the Bible, incest is not acceptable.

Winter does Reconstruction once again in relation to this, and his Reconstruction of the incestuous man as 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. In other words, if we think about chapters 1 to 4, where we have this social status issue going on, and if this person who was basically proud of living with his father's wife, who would have been his stepmother, and if he was a person of status and power within the city, to call his hand on this behavior could have put that local church within jeopardy, either financially, politically, and in other ways. And so, there is the implication, because they had not called him on the carpet, that perhaps they were favoring his status and disobeying biblical ethics by doing so.

So, excuse me, I need to check this camera. I heard something. I want to make sure that we're still taping here and not been cut off, and I would have to redo it.

Everything looks to be okay. I'm doing this by myself. I have no helper here.

And so, consequently, every now and then, I may have to do that. I'd hate to speak for an hour or so and then realize I have to do it all again. I don't think I can remember what I was talking about.

All right. Secondly, page 66, two-thirds of the way down. One possible dimension of this man's status could be that of a benefactor.

Benefactor is a technical term that was used during this period for somebody who supported a guild or supported a group, and the church had its benefactors. Chloé was probably a benefactor of the church, and these house churches often related to people who had the means and could do this for those who would gather for worship. If so, to offend the benefactor would undermine the church's influence in the community and perhaps even invite hostility.

Now, when we think about this in our own day and time, we might say, well, this is silly. They need to stand up for what's right regardless. But you've got to get your heads back into the fact that that culture was controlled by status, controlled by people of status, controlled by people of status who had power in the city, and they were not used to challenging that.

In fact, they were used to listening to the people of status for guidance about life. So, these new Christians were in a very difficult situation if, indeed, the man who was committing this sin was a person of status or a benefactor. Okay, now we'll come back to some of that, but let's think about the structure a little bit.

Once again, I like to read Talbert. I always like to read him to see how he sees structure. I don't always accept it, and as you will discover if you read his work, Talbert is very prone to see chiasms.

In fact, you need to correct some spelling errors in your notes. It may say chiasm. Take the I out before the M. That's chiasm.

There's no I. It's SM. So, you've got chiasm, chiasmus, chiastic. This is a certain kind of structure.

And the A is sexual problems in Chapter 5. The B are lawsuits in Chapter 6. And then A prime, that's the A with the little asterisk behind it, is sexual problems in the name of fornication in the last part of Chapter 6. So, that could be a chiasm. A chiasm is merely when you start, you have a hinge, and you come back to where you started. And this would be a very brief one.

It's possible, but he sometimes tends to see them everywhere. However, chiasms were a very common literary device in the ancient world. It goes all the way back into the time of Moses writing the Pentateuch.

In Genesis, where we have the flood narrative, rather a long narrative, the entire flood narrative is a chiasm. There is an article on this by Wenham, W-E-N-H-A-M, Wenham, in *Vetus Testamentum*, I think it is. But if you go and look for Wenham, there's a Gordon, and I think this one was Gordon. There's a Gordon and a John.

But he has an article on the flood narrative. He shows you a chart of how the entire flood narrative has these endpoints, and then in that sort of structure, each point answers the other point. Guess what the center is? The very center of the flood narrative is that phrase, when God is rehearsing the flood in his judgment and is not going to judge the world that way again, the Bible says, God remembered.

That's the very center of the flood narrative. So, chiasms are very common in ancient literary settings. As you read 1 Corinthians 5 and 6, note how much emphasis is given in these chapters to the community.

And yet, we have individuals who are stimulating these rumors and these problems. We've got this prominent man and his stepmother. We've got the problems of court cases, which aren't even identified specifically but only generally.

Because 5 and 6 are looking at these problems from a community standpoint. Now that's very important. It was the community, not just the individuals, who were creating risk because the community was tolerating deviant behavior.

Paul says to purge out the old leaven. So the community can be pure. That's the imagery from the Old Testament.

The community is a temple of sacred space. When it talks about, don't you know that your bodies are the temple of God, some texts talk about that individually. We are the temple of God.

Some texts use the plural, meaning the church is the temple of God. And so, the fact is that the church is not a building. It's the people. It's the people.

As a result, look at the community aspect of what's going on in chapters 5 and 6, and not just think about individuals. We'll see this over and over again. On page 67, at the top, there's a thematic cohesion.

A community full of strife, pride, and grief is evidenced by the sexual and legal case studies that come up in 5 and 6. Paul uses in 6.5 the word shame. This is a culture that shame, particularly if you shamed your guilt, or you shamed your status, or whatever it might be, was a very, very strong ethical and moral term. And so, Paul plays off of that word.

He appeals to their shame, which in their culture would threaten their self-view and their reputation. He uses vice catalogs in 5:9-11 and 6:9-10. Vice catalogs, I put in quote, because there's a huge literary device called virtue and vice list that existed before the New Testament and existed within the New Testament. I have a lecture on this on my website, gmeters.com, under the teaching and under Fruit of the Spirit.

There are some brief videos there, but there are some one-hour lectures. In those lectures, I talk about virtue and vice lists because the Fruit of the Spirit is a virtue list. The works of the flesh is a vice list.

Both outside the Bible and internal to the Bible, we have these virtue and vice lists to sort of gather a focus on issues of good and bad. So that's something to be keeping your eyes out for. Now, as we go and look at the chapter itself, after this brief introduction, you'll notice that it is on page 67.a, Paul responds to the report concerning scandalous morality.

This is chapter 5. Scandalous morality. First of all, he responds to the issue of incest in verses 1-8. These are very packed verses.

He points out the fact of incest in verse 1, and then we're going to see that he bemoans the lack of repentance in verses 2-8. So, the fact of incest and the lack of repentance on the Corinthians' part in regard to that incest in the latter part of this big paragraph of 8 verses. Reported as among you, is what 5:1 said, points out that Paul was not just responding to the sin of one man, even though that is the occasion for this.

But it had to do with the sin of the church at Corinth. The church, as a body, is responsible for its members. If one member deviates from the norm, it affects the whole body.

This is a biblical presentation all the way from Genesis to Revelation. You're never the lone ranger to use kind of an American idiom of that great cowboy who wore the mask and had Tonto. You're never a lone ranger in God's work.

It's always, always, always a community. The situation that was going on. Well, let's look at the text here.

In chapter 5, verse 1, we see it is actually reported that there is sexual morality among you. There is sexual morality among you—the first bullet point.

The present infinitive has, and that's the second half here, that a man has his father's wife. The NIV says he is sleeping with his father's wife, which is a good dynamic equivalent because it explains the word. King James says he has his father's wife.

The formal ones will say that. But we know what that means. It's sort of a softer way of saying it.

But it's in the present imperative, which means it's something that's going on. It's not just an event that happened, but it is an ongoing issue—a process rather than just one act.

You can see Leviticus, you can see Deuteronomy, which talks about the negation of this. We might ask ourselves a couple of questions. Did marriage provide the church with an excuse not to act? In other words, if this man married his stepmother.

Now we don't even know whether his father is alive or dead, see. There are no details about that. So, there's another whole aspect that's not brought to the table about this individual.

It's very clear Paul's not focusing on the intricacy of the individual. He's focusing on how the community deals with it. But the fact is that perhaps, just as a scenario.

If this person married his stepmother. And let's assume, just for the sake of argument, that his father is actually still alive. That would be incest.

It is incest even if the father's dead in the thinking of the first century. In the thinking of an Old Testament view of this. But we've got incest going on.

But the church in Corinth could have thought, well. If he's married, it must be okay. What can we say now? It's over.

Well, I don't think Paul viewed it that way. Or a second question could be. Was the church's action hampered by the social structures? This issue of status has already been mentioned.

The option for this man is he's living together on a regular basis, and he has her. Or that he's married. The text is not as clear as we might like for that. It seems that married sort of tips the scale. And most commentators think that he was, which would make it more difficult for the church to challenge him at least at a cultural level. Let's not get too highfalutin for our own good here.

Remember, these were brand new Christians in a world where Christianity never existed. Until they came across it, and they'd got all kinds of influences from their own backgrounds.

These people were having a difficult time. But we're probably in some ways ahead of us. Because they were at least struggling with it.

The third bullet. A practice worse than a heathen. Jewish law says it's worse.

And so do external sources. Richard Hayes, who, by the way, is another good commentator on 1 Corinthians. It's a brief one which is nice because you can get a synthesis.

I like Hayes' writing. He's a fine writer. He quotes Cicero in this regard.

Here's another quotation there on page 67. And so, mother-in-law marries son-in-law with none to bless.

None to sanction the union. And amid naught but general foreboding. Oh, to think of the woman's sin.

Unbelievable. It's unheard of in all experience. Save for this single instance.

Cicero is obviously talking about something in his own time and space. There's a lot of interesting details that we can't think about here. But notice how patriarchal this is.

It's the woman who ought to have the shame. What about the man? Well, back in those days, men got away with a lot of things. And the woman got the blame.

To think of her wicked passion. Unbridled. Untamed.

To think that she did not quail. If not before the vengeance of heaven. Which in Latin means 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.

I broke through and laid low every obstacle. Lust triumphed over modesty. Wantonness over scruple.

Madness over sense. Wow. Cicero was quite a preacher, wasn't he? I mean, you could take this and preach it.

You just pack your bags before you get too carried away. We should get carried away. We need more of this kind of preaching in our settings.

Because we become lax concerning biblical morality, but that's powerful. Cicero's writing. Now Cicero was an orator. He was skilled and trained even. In being able to use words and make them powerful.

As you do public speaking about the Bible. I hope you'll think about this principle. Words are your vehicle.

You know you're not just doing a movie on the screen. Look at all the money that Hollywood and other productions spend. To get people's attention with all the amazing graphics.

And reconstructions that they can do these days. But when a person gets up to represent Yahweh. The true God of the universe.

We only have our words. We better learn how to speak. And use our words.

Cicero did. We could take some advice on that score. I had the privilege on a couple of occasions.

I heard and even had meals with Bruce Metzger, who was a professor of Greek and New Testament at Princeton for years. A good Presbyterian. Good conservative Presbyterian scholar.

A major international Greek scholar. And he reflected once in a conversation about this. He said the choice between the right word and the wrong word in a sermon. It is like the difference between a firecracker and a stick of dynamite.

Even in his conversational speech. He used words that were powerful: a firecracker or a stick of dynamite.

Cicero is throwing out some dynamite here in terms of his wording. So, the culture did not approve of what was going on in 1 Corinthians 5. And for some reason, and that's another issue in itself.

Certain individuals in this church thought they could do things. That even their own culture would not allow them to do so. And have some sort of freedom to do so.

Paul says no, that's not the case. Winter once again. The bottom of page 67.

Adultery and incest were treated in Roman criminal law. Now, Rome was a litigious society. The reason that Rome was able to control all that Alexander the Great conquered.

Then, he gave to his generals and his sons. I shouldn't say sons, but he gave to his generals to rule. And they blew it.

But Rome moved in and just morphed into the whole thing. And took over everything that Alexander had conquered. Why was Rome able to do that? Because Rome was organized.

Alexander was great at winning battles and conquering lands. But he wasn't so good at taking care of it after it was over. But Rome was.

And so Rome came in and took care of it. Rome had an intricate legal system. And there were all kinds of levels of law.

The law that we'll talk about in chapter 6 is probably more of a civil law court. This law is criminal law—this thing of incest within the Roman Empire.

Even in that empire, it was criminal law. It's viewed as a very serious violation. Requiring punishment.

Something from exile to death. So, the church was not on its own here in dealing with this individual.

But it hadn't done so when adultery and incest were involved—the Roman statute of limitations.

Which was usually 5 years. Did not apply. That's how seriously they took this.

Now, in the Roman Empire. Sex was widespread. There's a saying that if a woman only knew two men regularly.

She was exceedingly virtuous. So, Rome was not unaware of sexuality. And of sexual licentiousness.

And of every manner of sexual licentiousness. But Rome did one thing. They protected the setting of a legal wife and a legal husband.

The husband could run around all over the place and have sex. But there was this issue of the legal wife and husband. That could not be broken.

If he went and got another legal wife. Then, he would be guilty of adultery. And subject to criminal court.

Yet he could have paramours all over the place. We'll come back to this in another setting a little bit later. And so, we have this practice that's worse than the heathen.

And that's worthy of criminal law. And even without a statute of limitation. So, this is very serious stuff.

Roman law favored, however, persons of status. Here comes the twist—the right of prosecution of a person of status.

It was limited in Roman law. You could not if you were a person of non-status. You couldn't even take a person of status to court.

Because of the pecking order of the legal system favoring Roman citizens. Favoring the person who had status within the city.

And within that Roman system. So, some of that is going on. Particularly, we'll see when we come over to chapter 6, when adultery and incest were involved.

The statute of limitations was out. Roman law favored this person of status. Incest required a formal act of accusation.

In order to prosecute. Particularly against a person of status. So, consequently.

Why was it that Corinth? The community of believers at Corinth. He had not only failed to deal with this man, but had a little bit of arrogance about it. And the answer is most likely.

Because he had status. And in their own cultural setting. They were giving credence to that status.

Rather than to the mores. The new religion that they adopted was called Christianity.

So, that's the fact. And it's a pretty massive fact about this sin problem.

Secondly, on page 68. Paul bemoans the lack of repentance in light of the situation.

In verses 2 through 8. Paul minces no words here. He calls for the immediate—and severe excommunication.

Of the offender. They are to be addressed. He doesn't address the offender.

He addresses the church. It's the church's responsibility. The Corinthian attitude in 5.2. And you are proud.

Shouldn't you rather have gone into mourning? That's a metaphor of a funeral.

You ought to be holding a funeral instead of being proud of this. And have put out of your own fellowship.

The man who has been doing this. Now remember. This was read publicly.

I sure do want to see some videos of this. When my life is over on earth. I'm hoping to go to the video room.

And just watch this being read. And see who's out there listening. Well, this man was proud.

They were proud and arrogant. And who knows maybe he was sitting on the front row.

That's interesting. I, being suspicious as I am, think that the elder who received this letter was going to have to read it the next day. Well, how did? What did he think?

Did he warn this dude, don't be there tomorrow? Or maybe he was on the other side of the fence and said, oh boy, I get to read this. You know, there are so many human things that can go on in this setting, but we can't let our imaginations get too carried away.

The Corinthian attitude was one of pride. Garland points out that the term for pride, which means, the Greek term, phusio, means to be puffed up. It's translated proud in the formal equivalence.

It's translated arrogant, which is the same thing, just a more modern term. And it seems to serve as a catchword because it's mentioned not only here in 5:2 but it's in 4:6, 4.:8, 4:19, 8:1, and 13:4. It permeates the epistle. They were extremely arrogant because they were more confident about their social setting than they were the word of God.

The catchword perhaps provides continuation in his critique of the Corinthian problem. So, they were allowing their social structures to trump God's teaching. In some sense, they were boasting about this situation.

Was such arrogance related to the man's social status? He's the culprit. You know, when I read this passage, I can't help but think about a number of occasions through my years of ministry when people of high presence in the American church culture have committed sexual sins. I'm talking about major national American personalities and people who are probably known abroad as well.

And it always seems to be sort of the same scenario. They get caught. Then they confess.

Then, they act repentantly. Then they want their job back. Well, I'm not so sure that's the way Paul would look at it.

They should repent. They should submit themselves to their congregations. But I don't see a path, frankly, back into that kind of leadership.

Once blatant, buried, hidden, and not confessed until caught, sexual sin occurs. They're out. And in my opinion, they should stay out.

Human nature, once it violates an ethic of that magnitude, is sorely tempted to do it again. And we have seen occurrences of doing it again. Saying they can't go back to ministry is not to say they can't be forgiven.

But there's a difference between being forgiven and being qualified for a role of major leadership in the church. Well, I'm talking to a camera. And you can talk back to me all you want, but I can't hear you.

There is some advantage to audio and video lectures, I suppose. So, there was the presence of pride. There was the absence of mourning.

They should have been going to a funeral, not being arrogant about it. So, Paul calls for discipline after he abrades them about their attitude. He delineates a three-fold involvement in the discipline.

Paul mentions it, the Lord is present, and the church has the responsibility to enact it. He says in 5:3 and 4, when you are assembled. That implies that the early church observed and understood the structures it utilized to do business.

It was a church business. I believe very much in elders, but I still think that there is autonomy in the total church with elders as leaders. We need to be careful as we apply the point of elder leadership rather than single pastors, as is often culturally true in the USA anyway.

It's a plurality of leadership, and there is a congregational sense to this leadership when the church is assembled. The addition of, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, in the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, brings out that the church is responsible to God, not just to Paul. A detailed interpretation of the text illustrates the importance of punctuation placement in this passage.

5:5 is a minefield in rendering it. Let's look at it for a second. Go back to verse 4. So, when you are assembled, reading the 2011 NIV, and I am with you in spirit, and the power of our Lord Jesus is present, hand this man over to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, so that his spirit may be saved on the day of the Lord.

Your boasting is not good, which begins the next mini-paragraph. Now let's think about this—detailed interpretation in relation to punctuation.

Modern translations tend to insert full stops, that is, periods, in order to break up long sentences. 1 Corinthians 5, verses 3 to 5, is actually one sentence. This is one of the values of the more formal equivalent Bibles, like an ASV of 1901.

They did not break up the sentences. They had big run-on sentences. The RSV does not break them up as much.

The NIV breaks right into the middle of sentences, even breaks up participial clauses. It breaks things up into smaller bites, because it's writing to a culture that can't read anymore, can't sustain the larger thought. But 3 to 5 verses 3 to 5 is only one sentence, so it's got to be punctuated, in English anyway.

And what happens? In Greek, grammatical units, that is, phrases, dependent clauses, and prepositional phrases may be placed in a variety of sequences. English is a word order language. Word order is everything.

I can't say everything is word order. I say word order is everything. I can't say everything is order word.

I can't mess up all those words. It's gobbledygook if I do that. In Greek, units could be put all over the place.

Sometimes, the main verb may not come for three or four verses. You've got, like in 1 John, that which was in the beginning. That's a relative pronoun clause.

And you've got several of those before you even get to the main verb. Greek is wonderful in the sense that it can show emphasis by where it puts units. The problem is that it can put those units in all kinds of places.

As a result, you have to deal with the context of the sentence. Well, translations do that for you. Once again, don't be a victim of translations.

Be a student of translations. English requires a rather fixed sequence, making modifications dependent upon placement and punctuation. But Greek is not English and often leaves open where modifiers are placed.

Therefore, translation requires interpretation. Translation requires interpretation. An illustration of this is in this prepositional phrase, in, which is, in is the preposition of course, in the name of our Lord Jesus in 5.4. Now, I've given you a chart at the top of page 69.

And this chart uses the four versions I've chosen. And remember, the NIV here is the NIV of 58 or in the 60s. And 2011, I really need to put that in.

I guess I need to extend my column because it's interesting to see how 2011 changed the previous NIV so much. And I think it changed it way up in the 90 percentiles to the better. So, the King James, notice what it does.

In the bold phrase, in the name of our Lord Jesus, look, it's got a comma before and after. What does that mean? It means they were non-committal. They didn't attach it before.

They didn't attach it after. They set it off. So, the reader's going to have to make a judgment.

So, though I were present concerning him who has done this deed, he has done this deed in the name of the Lord Jesus. Did the man do it in Jesus' name? Was he that arrogant? Or in the name of the Lord Jesus, when you're gathered together, does it go there? Where are you going to put it? Prepositional phrases are always adverbial. They have to modify something.

They don't stand on their own in this kind of instruction. The KJV was non-committal. And if you're a good reader, you're going to ask that question.

Or you're just going to read and make surface assumptions, which is usually what people do—the NRSV. Notice there's a semicolon after the beginning as, if I were present, as if present, I have already pronounced judgment in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Now notice that it's tied to Paul's pronouncing judgment. He hadn't mentioned that yet in the KJV. Notice how much longer the NRSV is than the KJV.

There are a lot of things added here. The NRSV is being functional, if you please, to try to help the reader. But now, in the name of the Lord, Jesus is attached to pronouncing judgment.

Not to the gathering. The NIV, the early NIV, the original, went down about six lines down when you are assembled in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Well, they made it pretty clear where they're taking it. Assembled. They take it with being assembled in the name of the Lord.

The 2011 doesn't do that. Listen to what the 2011 does in 5:4. So, when you are assembled, I, that is Paul, am with you in spirit. And the power of the Lord Jesus is present.

It sets it off a little bit, and it looks at the community, that when the community meets, Jesus is there. And so, the NIV is getting to that. The 2011 gets at it a little more indirectly.

When two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. It could be an analogy as to what happened there. Translations.

The New Living Translation. I have already passed judgment in the name of the Lord Jesus. Now, it's taken back and connected to Paul's passing judgment and claim of the name of Lord Jesus as part of that judgment.

Claiming that authority. So, these phrases are all over the place. The King James Version, for example, the phrase goes with what precedes or follows.

Well, the logic there would be to follow because it would be, it would sound ludicrous for this dude to be saying, I'm doing this in the name of the Lord, even though there is a view about that. The NRSV, Paul, already decided in the name of the Lord Jesus. The NIV assembled in the name of the Lord Jesus.

The New Living Translation, Paul did it in the name of the Lord Jesus. And so there you have it. We're back to looking at English translations that are making interpretations.

That could be pretty major in some ways. I mean, it may not be the end of the day about theology, but at the same time, this is a very interesting question. Does translation make a difference? What are you reading? I mean, it's a little bit of stress for me in a sense because I've got a couple of Bibles up here and I've got the Greek New Testament and I'm trying to talk to you in an English lecture type of situation, and yet I might have several versions going on in terms of the way that language is.

So, we learn from it. If you look at the variations of N in terms of interpretation, here they come. One view, A, N goes with the genitive absolute, assembled when you've assembled in the name.

Or B, with assembled but to construe the power to deliver in the name of the Lord Jesus. C goes with assembled, that verb see, but connected to with power in the name of the Lord Jesus, to deliver with power. D, N modifies to consign or deliver, deliver in the name of the Lord Jesus.

E, N governs remaining clauses of 5, 4, and 5, the whole thing instead of everything's done in Jesus' name. Or F, N modifies I have already judged in the name of the Lord Jesus. So as far as the literature is concerned, we've got about six variations here, more or less about how to nuance what this imprimatur in the name of the Lord Jesus, that's a statement of authority, that's a claim of authority.

Where do you attach it? Thistleton, in his commentary, makes this comment, quote, such as the length of the single convoluted sentence in verses 3 to 5. Convoluted sounds negative; Thistleton's not a negative person, but let's just say in this Greek complex sentence in verses 3 to 5 that it is difficult to argue for one view over another. With this caveat, however, we concluded that E, that is N governs all of the clauses, has most to commend it on the grounds of its status as a speech act. While C, that is, a symbol connected to with power, remains convincing as seriously possible.

And none of the options can be excluded with certainty except F. F modifies I have already judged, Paul already judged. I don't know if you noticed it or not, but the NRSV and the NLT chose F, and Thistleton says that's the only one that probably is

not a good idea. Don't you just love scholarship? And you'll say, throw up my hands. What am I going to do? Well, you're going to study, you're going to deal with the diversity, you're going to make some judgments, you're going to be humble, and you're going to move on and live your life.

There is even another view of this prepositional phrase. Garland points it out while not accepting it. He says it's gaining acceptance that N modifies the man's actions.

The one who did this in the name of the Lord Jesus. Now, we might laugh at that at first, but we won't laugh quite as much after we've read Winter's analysis of Roman Corinth and the status and benefactors and people who were arrogant about their freedom. Maybe this dude was so out of touch with biblical ethics, and maybe he didn't know the biblical story.

Maybe he had no Old Testament consciousness because he wasn't Jewish, and the New Testament hasn't been around long enough as far as what was written, and he wasn't imbibed in it adequately. He was operating almost in a vacuum from his own past, and yet he's a new Christian. He says, well, I'm a Christian.

I can do anything I want to do, and I want to marry my mother-in-law. Excuse me, my stepmother, and I'm going to do it in Jesus' name. Jesus has given me freedom. Well, we might think that rather bizarre, but it might not have been as bizarre in that culture because people had not yet learned even the ABCs of Christian ethics, and to be quite frank, in a few Christian settings, even in America from time to time, you get people who are just that arrogant.

It does seem unlikely, but it could be shockingly true in light of the culture that we're dealing with and the Christians we're dealing with. It does maintain the natural order of the way the Greek is phrased here, but we know that we don't have to keep that order because each unit is attached to another unit, and that unit may not be the closest unit. Garland himself rejects this view, but the idea that this man was bold in claiming a new ideology, a new theology.

Look at me, how free I am. Remember, he is doing it not only in the face of Paul, he's doing it in the face of his own culture. A new theology, an ideology, is becoming more common.

Reconstruction of this text in light of Roman elitism makes such a bold assertion possible, but it's not become a popular view by any stretch of the imagination. Well, I've come to 5.5, which has a whole other set of problems. We're going to give this dude to Satan.

What in the world does that mean? Well, I can see that my lecture is about 50 minutes in, and while I wanted to get this whole chapter 5 in one lecture, I'm not

going to aggravate you with a horrible amount of time. I'm trying to stay within an hour under, and it's going to be falling a little under on this occasion. So, we will come back to page 70 in the next lecture and talk about handing this sinful man, this arrogant person who's committed this act of incest, over to Satan and discuss what that means.

You can read the notes in the meantime, as well as a commentary, and answer all those questions before I even speak. Maybe I'll just have a silent hour next time, and you can enjoy yourself. Well, anyway, it's good to be with you, and we'll see you in the next lecture.

This is Dr. Gary Meadors in his teaching on the book of 1 Corinthians. This is lecture 14, Paul's Response to Certain Oral Reports/Rumors, 1 Corinthians 5:1-6:20.