



UNIVERSIDADE CATÓLICA PORTUGUESA

FACULDADE DE TEOLOGIA

MESTRADO INTEGRADO EM TEOLOGIA (1.º grau canónico)

MICHAEL TONY

1 COR 7:1-7: A CRUX INTERPRETUM

Dissertação Final

sob orientação de:

Prof Dr. Arnold T. Monera

Lisboa

2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Prima facie, I am beholden to God for the good health and wellbeing that are necessary to complete this paper.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Arnold T. Monera Ph.D.-S.T.D, Dean of the Faculty of Religious Studies, for his excellent guidance, understanding, patience, and providing me with all the necessary materials and an excellent place to work on this dissertation. His suggestion and supervision are invaluable to me during the course of my writing.

I am also grateful to all the professors and lecturers who have tutored me during my five years of study at St. Joseph University, Macau. I am indebted to them all for sharing their expertise and valuable knowledge.

I also take this opportunity to express thankfulness and gratefulness to all members of the community at the Priory of St. Dominic, Macau, for their fraternal help and support. And my sense of gratitude goes to one and all who have lent directly or indirectly their hand during my academic years.

Last, but not certainly least, huge thanks to all those, especially my family, classmates and friends, who are near and dear to me and accompany me along the way and help me one way or another in this remarkable journey of pursuing philosophy and theology here in Macau.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER ONE: 1 CORINTHIANS IN A NUTSHELL	3
1. The City of Ancient Corinth	5
2. The Occasion of 1 Corinthians.....	6
3. Authenticity and Integrity of the Letter	8
4. 1 Cor 7:1-7 in the Context of 1 Corinthians.....	10
CHAPTER TWO: ANALYSIS OF 1 COR 7:1-7.....	13
1. A Colometric Presentation of 1 Cor 7:1-7	14
2. Terminological Analysis of 1 Cor 7: 1-7	15
3. Syntactic Analysis of 1 Cor 7:1-7	28
a. Some Syntactical Observation	28
b. Structure of 1 Cor 7:1-7	30
c. Paul’s Line of Thought.....	31
CHAPTER THREE: THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF 1 COR 7:1-7	40
1. Christians Today and Corinthian Christians: Attitude toward sexuality.....	40
2. Values of Human Sexuality and Sexual Responsibility.....	44
3. Sexuality and Chastity/Sexual Moderation.....	47
CONCLUSION.....	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY	55

INTRODUCTION

During the course of my four years of theological studies, a number of professors frequently spoke about the apostle Paul, mainly because of his theology that has shaped Christianity since antiquity. Paul lived in an era where the so-called three worlds met: a monotheistic religion of Judaism, a speculative thinking of Greek philosophy and the governance of Romans. After encountering Christ on the way to the Damascus, as an itinerant preacher of the gospel of his time the apostle Paul moved from place to place, travelling around the Mediterranean world, and founding Christian communities. That is something I find fascinating as a student of theology and I could not help being impressed by his achievements.

One of the communities that Paul established is at Corinth. Having political and economic significance on the one hand and licentiousness and religious syncretism on the other hand, an olden leading Greek city like Corinth had all the accoutrements of the best and the worst of an ancient world. Smitten by philosophical trends and raised on a body-soul dichotomy that were part of the Greek world view, the Corinthians, especially Gentile converts, had great difficulty in understanding Paul's gospel.¹

Dissimilar to the ancient city of Corinth and its citizens, we are living in a globalized world characterized by advancement in economy, science and technology. It is, however, also marred by disparities, conflicts, and problems. Like Corinthians, many of us still have a hard time to understand the theology of Paul in today's context.

¹ Mary Ann Getty, "1 Corinthians," *The Colleagueville Bible Commentary: New Testament*, eds Robert J. Karris (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 1100-1133, esp. 1101.

In the so-called First Letter to the Corinthians, Paul addressed a wide range of issues including subjects of marriage, singleness, eating food offered to idols, spiritual gifts, and propriety in worship, orderliness in the Lord's Supper and what happens to the body after death or about resurrection. They appeared to be the basic problems of Corinthians. One of the increasing problems that the Church is facing today is the issue of sexual morality that the Corinthians also faced. Comparable to these days, in the Greco-Roman world, various forms of sexual licentiousness were common. One can then wonder what might be the issues of sexual morality in the time of Paul and in the early Church. Questions that plague the Church today are remarkably similar to those that Paul had to answer in 1 Corinthians. So we can receive specific guidance in these areas from Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians.

Hence, for this dissertation, I have chosen to investigate a passage from 1 Corinthians, i.e., 1 Cor 7:1-7. This paper is divided into three chapters: (a) 1 Corinthians in a nutshell, (b) an investigation of terminological and syntactic analyses of 1 Cor 7:1-7, and (c) an appropriation of the passage in today's context. The City of ancient Corinth, Paul's occasion of writing 1 Corinthians, authenticity and integrity of the letter are the main contents of Chapter One. In Chapter Two, as it is the main section of the study, the focus is on the pericope itself. Finally, theological implications of 1 Cor 7:1-7 is discussed in Chapter Three, followed by conclusion.

CHAPTER ONE

1 CORINTHIANS IN A NUTSHELL

Of the thirteen letters traditionally attributed to Paul, it is nowadays accepted that only seven letters (also called *homologoumena* letters) are undisputedly ascribed to Paul.² Most scholars judge that as many as six letters (also called *antilegomena*) were written by his disciples, or by later members of his churches after his death in his name, not by the apostle himself.³ Seven authentic letters accredited to Paul are analogous in terms of writing style, vocabulary, and theology and the issues that they address can be traced back to the time that Paul was actually active as an apostle and missionary.⁴ Among these authentic Pauline letters is the First Letter to the Corinthians.

Paul is the *pater fundator* of the Christian community in Corinth where he stayed for some eighteen months (see Acts 18:11). It was a community Paul loved so much, yet he admitted coming to this city “in weakness and in fear and in much trembling” (1 Cor 2:3). From Corinth Paul proceeded to Ephesus (see Acts 19:1). It was while Paul was in Ephesus that he received some disheartening reports (both oral

² Paul’s undisputed letters are 1 Thessalonians, Philippians, Philemon, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans. Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans are referred to as great letters mainly because of their strength and importance for Christian teaching. It is also that they are fully consistent with one another as regards doctrine, style, outlook, and are stamped with Paul’s strong personality. *The Navarre Bible: The Letters of Saint Paul, Texts and Commentaries* (Dublin/ New York: Four Courts Press/ Scepter Publishers, 2003).

³ All of the so-called Pauline letters are not to be considered of equal value of reconstructing the life of Paul. See Marion L Soards, *The Apostle Paul: An Introduction to His Writings and Teaching* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1987), 8. It is no surprise that some ancient authors would pseudonymously attribute their writings to a famous person like Paul. Ehrman D. Bart, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*, 2nd edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 261.

⁴ Bart, *The New Testament*, 262.

and written) about recent problems that had arisen in the young church. All these problems can only be reconstructed based on Paul's *1 Corinthians*. Besides the oral reports from Chloe's people (1Cor 1:11) about the internal division in Corinth (see 1:10-12; 3:4-5; 11:18-19), sexual immorality (5:1-13; 6:12-20), and non-Christian judicial practice (6:1-11), Paul has likewise received a letter from the Corinthian church concerning varied issues in the community most likely hand carried by the group of Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus who had come to visit Paul in Ephesus (16:17-18).⁵ In 1 Cor 7:1 Paul speaks of that letter sent by the Corinthian community: "Now concerning [περὶ δέ] the matters about which you wrote." The commentator Kirsopp Lake wrote, "It seems as though the greater part of 1 Corinthians VII-XVI is based directly on the letter."⁶ This possibly explains the reason why the topics change so radically: "In chapter 7 Paul is dealing with relations between sexes; then in chapter 8 he switches to the discussion of meat offered to idols. He moves from women praying and prophesying in the congregation (11:2-16), to the Lord's Supper (11:17-34), to spiritual gifts (chapters 12-14), and the resurrection (chapter 15)."⁷ Most of these topics are introduced with the formula περὶ δέ.

For us to have a better grasp of the multi-faceted issues raised in 1 Corinthians, it is important to have a broader picture of the concrete Corinthian *Sitz-im-Leben*.

⁵ Arnold T. Monera, "Glossolalia and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians: A Survey of Related Literature" (STL Thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1994), 3.

⁶ Kirsopp Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul: Their Motive and Origin* (London: Rivingtons, 1911), 136.

⁷ Monera, "Glossolalia and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians," 3.

1. The City of Ancient Corinth

As the capital of Roman province Achaia (modern day Greece) serving as a gateway between the East and the West, the port city of Corinth was strategically a major center of trade and communication, and politically played a significant role in Greek history and in the whole Mediterranean world of the first century.⁸ Geographically, the ancient Corinth was a rich, populous city with fertile lands and was considered as one of the greatest commercial trades in the ancient world. In addition, the city was the place where the Isthmian Games were held.⁹

Maria A. Pascuzzi writes, “By the time Paul arrived, about A.D. 50/51, Corinth was emerging as Greece’s premier city and the commercial, manufacturing, and cultural mega center of the entire eastern Mediterranean.”¹⁰ Although Corinth exhibited all the tough features of an important city of commerce whose population was mixed and mobile, economic and political growth did not necessarily promote ethical development.¹¹ In addition, Corinth was usually associated with luxury, drunkenness, sexual immorality and debauchery. Perhaps 1 Cor 6:9-10 reflects the licentiousness of the Corinthian city: “Do you not know that wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived! Fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes,

⁸ It is a place brought together centuries earlier as part of the political vision of the Alexander the Great (d. 323 BCE) who dreamed of ruling over a harmonious, unified world to achieve hegemony producing a culturally homogeneous population. See Soards, *The Apostle Paul*, 14; Getty, *1 Corinthians*, 1102.

⁹ William Barclay, *The Letters to the Corinthians*, The New Daily Study Bible (Bangalore: Theological Publications, 2009), 3.

¹⁰ Maria A. Pascuzzi, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” *New Collegeville Bible Commentary*, ed. Daniel Durken (Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2008), 480.

¹¹ According to Barclay, the residents of Corinth were made up of Roman veterans who were resettled by Julius Caesar, merchants who were attracted by the city’s commercial supremacy, Jews who were persuaded by the city’s commercial opportunities, and Phoenicians and Phrygians with their exotic customs (*The Letters to the Corinthians*, 3).

sodomites, thieves, the greedy, drunkards, revilers, robbers- none of these will inherit the kingdom of God. And this is what some of you used to be.”

2. The Occasion of 1 Corinthians

All the genuine letters of Paul are *ad hoc* letters. 1 Cor is a situational, exhorting and warning letter aimed at correcting the wrong convictions of Corinthians. Scholars have sought to subsume all the Corinthian problems under one particular theme without much success. For instance, Walter Schmithals has offered the suggestion that Gnosticism was the root problem in Corinth.¹² Gordon Fee thinks that the historical situation in Corinth was one of conflict between the church and its founder, Paul.¹³ The Tübingen scholar Ferdinand Christian Baur blamed the problem in Corinth to the disturbing visit of Judaizers to the community because they presented themselves as representatives of authentic Christianity.¹⁴ Based on the so many proposals for the reconstruction of the Corinthian situation, Donald A. Carson pinpoints to three features that stand out in Paul’s arguments in 1 Corinthians: (1) “Over-realized” Eschatology in Corinth; (2) A Divided Church; (3) Problem of Community Worship.

The *first* problem of the Corinthian community was their “over-realized” eschatology. A part of Paul’s teaching was to put the church in dynamic tension between an “already” view of what God has done, and a “not-yet” view of what he is

¹² Walter Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth: Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians*, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1971). The difficulty with this suggestion is various schools of Gnosticism flourished only in the second century C.E. It is widely accepted by scholars today that none of the essential phenomena of Gnosticism is present in 1 Corinthians.

¹³ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987; repr. 1991), 6. The key issue between Paul and the Corinthian community had to do with their understanding of what it means to be “spiritual” (πνευματικός).

¹⁴ Ferdinand Christian Baur, “Die Christuspartei in der Korinthischen Gemeinde,” *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 5 (1831): 61-206; cited in Monera, “Glossolalia and Prophecy,” 5.

still to do. Maintaining this balance was necessary to the church's maturity. The tendency in the Corinthian community, however, lies in the fact that they had over-emphasized "the already-aspect." F. F. Bruce notes, they "were speaking and acting as if they had already attained the kingdom and glory simultaneously with the gift of the Holy Spirit."¹⁵ Because they believed they were already "spiritual" – πνευματικοί ("people of the Spirit") they took an inferior view of continuing existence in the material, earthly world, including the body. The body (σῶμα) and everything material was seen as eschatologically insignificant (see 6:13; 15:2). Was this the reason why they were arguing for sexual asceticism in 1 Cor 7:1?

The *second* reason that gave occasion to Paul writing 1 Corinthians was the internal division within the community. This division, as reflected in 1 Cor (1:10-12; 3:4-5; 11:18-19), is not only expressed in the "party" labels ("I belong to Paul," or "I belong to Apollos," or "I belong to Cephas," or "I belong to Christ"), but also in a style of argumentation that permeates chapters 7-12. Carson describes it the "yes-but" form of argument.¹⁶

The *third* principal focus of 1 Corinthians, especially from chapter 11 onwards, is the conduct of the church as it is gathered together. There is not only factionalism in Corinth, but also disorder in community worship. It seems that some Corinthians were more bent on emphasizing a hyper-individualistic approach to worship.¹⁷ Each one wanted to do his or her own way. Thus, each one went ahead eating his own meal not

¹⁵ F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, NCBC (London, 1971; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 49.

¹⁶ For instance, Paul says, I would like every one of you to speak in tongues, *but* I would rather have you prophesy (14:5a). Or in 1 Cor 7:1-2, "It is well for a man not to touch a woman." *But* because of cases of sexual immorality, each man should have his own wife..."

¹⁷ D. Lührmann, *Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden*, WMANT, 16 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965): 38. Cited by Monera, "Glossolalia and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians," 11.

thinking of others. Each one was speaking at the same time and not listening to one another. In 1 Cor 14, Paul ends his treatment of the exercise of spiritual gifts in the context of communal worship with the words: πάντα δὲ εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω (“but all things should be done decently and in order”, v. 40).

In sum, the above reasons give us a picture of the Corinthian situation. It was a young Christianity marred by several internal problems. A factious spirit was threatening the unity of the church. There existed in the community moral and religious disorders, such as sexual licentiousness and the degeneration of the Lord’s Supper. Their over-emphasis on the “already” view of what God has done, priding on their freedom (6:12; 10:23) and knowledge (8:1), led them to the denial of a future resurrection since they believed that at present they did participate already in the heavenly glory. Therefore, the sexual licentiousness of the city led the Corinthians to sexual asceticism and disdain for the σῶμα. All these issues reached Paul in Ephesus through oral and written reports to which Paul tried to respond to in 1 Corinthians in the spring of 54 or 55 C.E.

3. Authenticity and Integrity of the Letter

There is no dispute as to the Pauline origin of 1 Cor. This issue has never been disputed and the letter is already attested in the 90s by Clement of Rome and in the first decade of the second century by Ignatius.¹⁸ This letter “was part of a continuing correspondence between himself and the Christians of Corinth.”¹⁹ Although called

¹⁸ S. J. Hafemann, “Letters to the Corinthians,” *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne & Ralph P. Martin (Downers Grove, IL/Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1993): 164-179, esp. 175.

¹⁹ Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, Sacra Pagina, 7, ed. Daniel J. Harrington (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 4.

First Corinthians, it was not the first letter Paul had written to that community. Prior to the canonical *First Corinthians*, Paul wrote a letter to the Corinthians advising them to avoid immoral persons: “I wrote to you in my letter not to associate with sexually immoral persons...” (1 Cor 5:9).²⁰ In fact, the canonical *Second Corinthians* “is at least Paul’s fourth letter to that community...”²¹ Hence, as part of an ongoing exchange of communications between Paul and the Corinthians, 1 Cor contains a response to the letter he had received from them (7:1). One of the issues raised in that letter was about sexual relations within marriage.

While the authenticity of the letter is not questioned, its integrity is being contested.²² Because of the length of this letter, coupled with the variety of subjects treated in it and the different ways Paul treats some of his topics have led many scholars to question whether 1 Corinthians as it presently exists was written by Paul in the form of a single letter.²³ Various commentators argue that extant 1 Cor is a composite. For instance, Walter Schmithals has vigorously argued that the present 1 Corinthian was compiled from two earlier letters, letter A (= 6:12-20; 9:24 -10:22; 11:2-34; 15; 16:13-14; and 2 Cor 6:14 – 7:1) and letter B (= 1:1- 6:11; 7:1 – 9:23; 10:23 – 11:1; 12:1 – 14:40; 16:1-12).²⁴ This composite of two earlier letters is also defended by Günther Bornkamm [1971] and Willi Marxsen [1978]. There are even scholars who think that the present 1 Cor is a compilation of three original letters (e.g., Alfred Loisy [1922],

²⁰ This letter, which is no longer extant, was meant to deal with some specific ethical issues being faced by the new church. “But the Corinthians,” according to Hafemann, “had difficulty understanding Paul’s admonitions and, in fact, misapplied them to their context (cf. 1 Cor 5:9-13)” (“Letters to the Corinthians,” 176).

²¹ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 4.

²² Georg Werner Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, Revised & Enlarged English Edition, trans. Howard Clark Kee (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1990), 276.

²³ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 11.

²⁴ Getty, *1 Corinthians*, 1102.

Wolfgang Schenk [1969]. In contrast, J. C. Hurd's *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* defends the unity of the letter claiming that despite the letter's apparent variation in tone and expression, 1 Corinthians is one single letter. According to him, differences are due to the different type of oral and written information Paul received.²⁵

4. 1 Cor 7:1-7 in the Context of 1 Corinthians

The opening verse of 1 Cor 7 indicates that the topic on sexual relations, marriage and celibacy was inspired by the Corinthians' letter to Paul based on the recurrence of the formula $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (7:1). The opening words, $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\tau\epsilon$, indicate that the Apostle is no longer responding to oral reports, as in chaps 5 and 6, but directly to a letter addressed from Corinth. The Corinthian community sent a letter to Paul brought by the messengers listed in 1 Cor 16:15-17 (Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus) in order to receive further clarification. The meaning and significance of the $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ formula will be discussed in Chapter Two of this dissertation. Suffice it to say at this point that the topic in the pericope under scrutiny is Paul's response to their query. Hafemann observes "the somewhat disjointed and topical nature of 1 Corinthians is due to the fact that Paul is responding in turn to the variety of issues and questions brought to him by the church's letter and to the reports he has heard."²⁶

According to Peter Brown, 1 Cor 7 is "the one chapter that was to determine all Christian thoughts on marriage and celibacy for well over a millennium."²⁷ In fact, 1 Cor 7 can be regarded as Paul's most extensive discussion of internal relationships,

²⁵ J. C. Hurd, *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (London: SPCK, 1965), 9ff.

²⁶ Hafemann, "Letters to the Corinthians," 176.

²⁷ Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University, 1988 / London: Faber and Faber, 1989), 54.

covering the subjects of marriage, divorce, and particularly celibacy which is discussed in more detail.²⁸ Containing Paul's most detailed teaching on marriage and sexual abstinence, according to Elizabeth A. Clark, 1 Cor 7 "proved sufficiently elastic to enable exegetes to express their varied ascetic preferences while expounding a text that they considered immutable and eternally valid."²⁹ William Loader also interestingly describes 1 Cor 7 as "Avoiding Porneia and Defending Marriage."³⁰ However, the chapter is not all about marriage and issues related to it, but also reflective of Paul's basic apocalyptic-eschatological outlook that the world was coming to its end (7:26, 29).³¹

Ronald D. Witherup also reasons that there may be a misconception that the Apostle Paul seems to be very negative about sex and preoccupied with sexual sins.³² As a result, there have been much of the discussion of chapter 7, present as well as past. And it is alleged that Paul's own sexual ethic was basically ascetic in character and that he promoted the idea of marriage and sexual relationships as a second best.³³ However, Witherup argues it is not that Paul is preoccupied with sexual sins, but had some strong

²⁸ Especially recent converts to Christianity needed clarification on the proper sexual conduct in a city where having multiple wives and sexual immorality were normal as a result of pagan worship (Acts 18:1).

²⁹ Elizabeth A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999): 259-329, esp. 259.

³⁰ William Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2012), 182.

³¹ Freed argues that the expressions "in view of the present crisis" and "the appointed time has grown short" are eschatological (*The New Testament: A Critical Introduction*, 264-265).

³² Ronald D. Witherup, *101 Questions & Answers on Paul* (Bangalore, Mumbai: Paulist Press, 2003), 173-209, esp. 173.

³³ James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Michigan: Grand Rapids/ Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1998), 689-691.

concerns about sexual promiscuity or improper sexual behavior.³⁴ Later in 7:25-38, Paul himself clarifies the reason why it is better not to marry.

In chapters 5 and 6, Paul has already begun to address issues about sexuality in the letter. A man living with his father's wife, some going to prostitutes, and court cases provoked by sexual conduct are addressed (see, 5:1-11, 6:12-20). In chapter 7, Paul is, therefore, trying to put sex in its proper place as some of the Corinthians argued that all sexual union should be avoided and that celibacy was to be preferred. According to Antoinette Clark Wire, it shows "Paul's ambiguous response to a pattern of withdrawing from long-term sexual relationship in the Corinthians church."³⁵ Paul's focus on sexuality falls within his wider concern that the Corinthians should live appropriately as those for whom Christ died (5:7-8, 6:11). This is arguably one main concern of the entire letter.³⁶ Thus, there were obvious existential problems in the newly founded Corinthian church which was struggling to be the people of God in a pagan city. Evidently one of the many issues raised in their letters to Paul concerns sexual morality. The following chapter is the investigation of terminological and syntactic analyses of 1 Cor 7:1-7.

³⁴ Witherup, *101 Questions & Answers on Paul*, 173.

³⁵ Some remaining married, and others leaving believing or non-believing spouses suggest that married people who come to believe do not automatically continue in previous sexual relationships. Antoinette Clark Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 72-93, esp. 72.

³⁶ Gatiss Lee, "1 Corinthians," *Central Focus Small Group Studies*, St. Helen's Bishopsgate: Bible Study Resources, 2008/9, 30-36, esp. 34.

CHAPTER TWO

ANALYSIS OF 1 COR 7:1-7

This paper follows the structure of the letter proposed and justified by Collins. In his commentary book *First Corinthians*, Collins carefully explores the letter as a kind of rhetorical speech. Paul's purpose in writing to the Corinthians is clearly admonitory, that is, he wants them to know what they should do and what they should not do.³⁷ The letter was written to persuade and dissuade the Corinthian Christians with regard to various forms of behavior on certain matters. Collins has closely paid attention to Paul's extensive use of chiasmic pattern (A-B-A¹) in his argumentation.³⁸ This fondness for chiasmic pattern probably represents a Semitic influence on the apostle's thought. The letters of Paul, 1 Corinthians included, "were meant to be read aloud in order to persuade the audience."³⁹ Consequently, like speeches, "they can be judged as rhetoric, in terms of the authority of the writer, the quality of the writing and the desired effect on the audience."⁴⁰

To demonstrate Paul's use of chiasmic pattern: In treating about the responsible use of sexuality, Paul in 1 Cor 5 writes about a problem in Corinth (A), then makes a digression in chap. 6 about the Christian's use of secular courts (B), and returns to the

³⁷ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 1.

³⁸ *Ibid.* According to Collins, "[t]o a large extent the letter as a whole is constructed according to a pattern of chiasmic parallelism."

³⁹ Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 411

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

sexual responsibility in chap. 7 (A¹). Even 1 Cor 7 is arranged according to chiasmic structure. “Having treated a variety of issues relating to the sexual life of those who are or had married (7:1-16, A), Paul speaks of social stability (7:17-24, B) before returning to his discussion of human sexuality, this time insofar as it relates to those who are not yet married (7:25-40, A¹).”⁴¹ From these two examples of chiasmic patterns where the passage under scrutiny belongs (1 Cor 7:1-7), we are already given the clue that it deals with sexual matters. Hence, 1 Cor 7:1-7 is examined by taking a closer look at vocabulary, syntax, and Paul’s line of thought.

1. A Colometric Presentation of 1 Cor 7:1-7

Greek text ⁴²	Translation in Colometric Presentation ⁴³
1. a. περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε, ⁴⁴ b. καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἄπτεσθαι.	1. a. Concerning now about which you wrote, b. (it is) good for a man not to touch a woman.
2. a. διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας, c. καὶ ἐκάστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω. d. ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω	2. a. But because of sexual immorality b. let each man have himself of a wife c. and each woman have her own husband.
3.a. τῇ γυναικὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἀποδιδότω, b. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρί.	3. a. To the wife let the husband fulfil the duty, b. likewise also the wife to the husband.

⁴¹ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 15.

⁴² Greek text is taken from Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland and et al., eds., *Greek-English New Testament*, 8th revised edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 450.

⁴³ This is my own initial translation.

⁴⁴ It is debated whether μοι (to me) is included. μοι was added in the later manuscripts such as A D F G y a b vg^{cl} sy co; but absent in the older manuscripts, such as papyrus 46 B C 33. 81.1739. 1881. 2464 pc r vgst.

<p>4. a. ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει.</p> <p>b. ἀλλὰ ὁ ἀνὴρ,</p> <p>c. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει</p> <p>d. ἀλλὰ ἡ γυνή.</p>	<p>4. a. The wife does not have control over her own body,</p> <p>b. but the husband does,</p> <p>c. likewise the husband does not have authority over his own body,</p> <p>d. but the wife has.</p>
<p>5. a. μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους,</p> <p>b. εἰ μήτι ἂν ἐκ συμφώνου πρὸς καιρὸν</p> <p>c. ἵνα σχολάσητε τῇ προσευχῇ</p> <p>d. καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦτε,</p> <p>e. ἵνα μὴ πειράζῃ ὑμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς</p> <p>f. διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν ὑμῶν.</p>	<p>5. a. Do not deprive one another,</p> <p>b. except by mutual agreement for a set time</p> <p>c. that you may devote to prayer</p> <p>d. and then be together again</p> <p>e. so that Satan might not attempt you</p> <p>f. because of your lack of self-control.</p>
<p>6. a. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω κατὰ συγγνώμην,</p> <p>b. οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγήν.</p>	<p>6. a. But this I say by way of concession,</p> <p>b. not by way of command.</p>
<p>7. a. θέλω δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἑμαυτόν,</p> <p>b. ἀλλὰ ἕκαστος ἴδιον ἔχει χάρισμα ἐκ θεοῦ</p> <p>c. ὁ μὲν οὕτως</p> <p>d. ὁ δὲ οὕτως.</p>	<p>7. a. Yet I wish all to be as myself,</p> <p>b. but each has a particular gift from God</p> <p>c. one in this kind,</p> <p>d. another in that kind.</p>

2. Terminological Analysis of 1 Cor 7: 1-7

Verse 1

- a. περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε,
- b. καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἄπτεσθαι

- a. Concerning now about which you wrote,
- b. (It is) good (well) for a man not to touch a woman.

(1) περὶ δέ

This is usually translated as “concerning.” It is a classic formula used to identify a topic that is about to be considered. It is like a topic marker. The formula was frequently used in Hellenistic letters to point to the matters raised in previous correspondences.⁴⁵ The use of περὶ δέ in v.1a indicates that Paul is responding to a letter that he had received from the Corinthians. Thus, besides v.1a the questions raised by the Corinthians are introduced by περὶ δέ in 7:25, 8:1, 12:1, 16:1.

(2) ἐγράψατε

It is second person, plural, aorist, active indicative of γράφω, meaning “to engrave, write according to the ancient method of writing on plates of metal, waxed tablets.”⁴⁶ The original meaning of the word as “scratch, engrave” occurs only at the periphery of the NT. In classical and Hellenistic Greek, the customary meaning of the word as “write” appears in the majority of cases in the NT.⁴⁷ In the context of 1 Cor 7:1 ἐγράψατε refers to the letter that some members of the Corinthian community had written to Paul regarding various issues affecting the community.

(3) ἀνθρώπῳ

It is dative, singular, masculine noun ἄνθρωπος, meaning “a human being, an individual and used also pleonastically with other words.”⁴⁸ The use of ἄνθρωπος in v. 1b is generic and denotes the human being as a living creature.⁴⁹ In v.1b, the

⁴⁵ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 257.

⁴⁶ Wesley J. Perschbacher, *The New Analytical Greek Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1990), 83.

⁴⁷ Hans Hübner, “γράφω,” *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. 1, eds. Horst Balz & Gerhard Schneider (Grand Rapids: Michigan, 1990), 261. Henceforth shall be rendered as *EDNT*.

⁴⁸ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 30

⁴⁹ Alexander Sand, “ἄνθρωπος,” *EDNT* 1 (1990):100-104, esp. 100.

translation could be, “It is good for a *man* not to have sexual intercourse at all with a woman.”

(4) καλόν

It is accusative, singular, masculine, adjective of καλός. Its proper meaning is “beautiful,” “good,” “fertile,” “useful,” “profitable”.⁵⁰ καλός can designate what is ethically good, noble worth striving for. In Paul it diminishes in significance in comparison with ἀγαθός. In the passage, however, καλός is used for ‘good’ instead of ἀγαθός.⁵¹ The expression “good for man” (καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ) echoes the language of the Stoics and Cynics where duty and responsibility are two important motifs.⁵² In v. 1b, the meaning of καλός can be translated as “that which is useful or pleasing, that which is suitable or appropriate for a situation.”⁵³ In Paul the use of καλός is absolute and it denotes the good which we wish to do inwardly.

(5) γυναικός

It is genitive, singular, and feminine noun γυνή meaning “woman, married woman, or wife.”⁵⁴ γυνή designates the woman as sexual partner in Matt 5:28, but in the context of 1 Cor 7:1a, it is without consideration of her age or situation.⁵⁵ The word ‘wife’ is used as the same word as “women” in 1 Cor 7:1 since the Greeks had no common distinctive word for wife or women.

⁵⁰ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 218.

⁵¹ Joachim Wanke, “καλός,” *EDNT 2* (1991): 244-245.

⁵² Marital responsibility and mutuality within the relationship are two of the motifs raised in the philosophic discourse. Duty and responsibility are very important for the Stoics, but so too is mutuality in marriage. See, Collins, *First Corinthians*, 255.

⁵³ Cleon L. Rogers Jr and Cleon L. Rogers III, *The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament* (Michigan: Grand Rapids, 1998), 360-361.

⁵⁴ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 84.

⁵⁵ Johannes B. Bauer, “γυνή,” *EDNT 1* (1990): 266.

(6) ἄπτεσθαι

It is present, middle, infinitive of ἄπτω. Its proper meaning is “to bring in contact, fit, and fasten; to light, kindle.”⁵⁶ “The word ‘touch’ was often used in the ancient world as a euphemism for sexual intercourse (Gen 20:6; Prov 6:29).”⁵⁷ Such is the meaning of ἄπτεσθαι in the context of 1 Cor 7:1b. Hence, v.1b wants to say, “It is good for a man not to have a *sexual intercourse* with a woman.” Whether this is Paul’s own statement or a slogan of the Corinthians will be discussed later.

Verse 2

- a. διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας
- b. ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἔχέτω
- c. καὶ ἑκάστη ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἔχέτω

- a. But because of sexual immorality
- b. let each man have himself of a wife
- c. and each woman have her own husband.

Verse 2 cannot be read independently of the preceding pattern of statement begun in v.1 since the conjunction διὰ has explanatory force related to the verb ἄπτεσθαι in v.1b.

(1) πορνείας

It is the accusative, plural, feminine noun πορνεία, meaning “fornication, whoredom” (Matt 5:19; Mark 7:21; Acts 15:20, 29); “concubinage” (John 8:41); “adultery” (Matt 5:32, 19:9); “incest” (1 Cor 5:1); “lewdness, uncleanness” (Rom 1:29)

⁵⁶ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 50.

⁵⁷ See Graydon F. Snyder, *First Corinthians: A Faith Community Commentary* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1992), 92.

and “idolatry” (Rev 2:21; 14:8).⁵⁸ The word occurs 26 times in the NT: 8 times with other vices, 3 times in Acts, 6 times in Pauline letters and 5 times in Revelation. πορνεία can be referred to as misconduct of every kind of unlawful sexual intercourse and fornication. It even includes homosexuality.⁵⁹ When used of sexual infidelity on the part of a married person it means ‘adultery,’ which is normally referred to with the word μοιχεία (adultery). Both πορνεία and μοιχεία frequently stand next to one another in vice catalogs.

πορνεία in 1 Cor 7:2 does not only mean ‘adultery,’ but rather sexual immoralities. Take note that πορνεία is in the plural form so perhaps what Paul meant by this term is all sorts of impurities and uncleanness.

(2) ἴδιον

Accusative, singular, masculine adjective of ἴδιος, meaning “one’s own, due, proper, specially assigned.”⁶⁰ In Pauline letters, adjective usage of ἴδιος often has its own theological emphasis and the individual reference is underscored by use with ἕκαστος. ἴδιος is used of the relationship of the wife to her husband or vice versa (Acts 24:24; 1 Cor 7:2, 4).⁶¹ Each husband should have his own wife, and vice versa.

(3) ἄνδρα

It is accusative, singular, masculine noun ἀνήρ, meaning “a male person of full age and stature, as opposed to a child or female.”⁶² In the context of v.2c, it can be then translated as ‘husband.’

⁵⁸ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 340.

⁵⁹ Gottfried Fitzer, “πορνεία,” *EDNT* 3 (1993): 137-139.

⁶⁰ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 206.

⁶¹ Hans-Werner Bartsch, “ἴδιος,” *EDNT* 2 (1991): 171-172.

⁶² Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 30

Verse 3

- a. τῇ γυναικὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἀποδιδότω,
- b. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρί.

- a. To the wife let the husband fulfil the duty
- b. likewise also the wife to the husband.

(1) ὀφειλήν

It is accusative, singular, feminine noun ὀφειλή, meaning ‘a debt, a duty, and due.’⁶³ The main issue here was the function of intercourse in the marriage relationship. This may sound strange to us since we do not talk about the frequency of sexual intercourse between husbands and wives. In the Jewish Mishnah (collection of Jewish opinions from the time just after the formation of the New Testament), however, the issue was discussed at length.⁶⁴ If the obligations were not met each of the party had a right to divorce. In v. 3a, Paul speaks of the debt or obligation (ὀφειλή) a husband has to a wife and a wife has to her husband. Each should fulfill to the other his/her conjugal rights for the purpose of avoiding sexual immorality.⁶⁵

(2) ἀποδιδότω

It is third person, singular, present, and active imperative of ἀποδίδομι, meaning “to give in answer to a claim or expectation; to render a due.”⁶⁶ In most instances, the subject of ἀποδίδομι is a person. The subject-object relationship is more

⁶³ *Ibid*, 300.

⁶⁴ Snyder, “First Corinthians,” 93.

⁶⁵ Michael Wolter, “ὀφειλή,” *EDNT* 2 (1991): 550.

⁶⁶ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 42.

personal when a man renders to his wife that to which she is entitled.⁶⁷ So, in the context of v. 3a, the likely meaning is ‘fulfilling one’s duty or rendering unto one’s spouse.’ In the context of marital sexual relations, which is Paul’s concern in this pericope, “the body of each is gifted to the other; it is thus owed to the other, creating a ‘debt’.”⁶⁸

Verse 4

- a. ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει
 - b. ἀλλὰ ὁ ἀνὴρ,
 - c. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει
 - d. ἀλλὰ ἡ γυνή.
-
- a. The wife does not have authority over her own body
 - b. but the husband does,
 - c. likewise the husband does not have authority over his own body
 - d. but the wife has.

According to Snyder, “verse 4 could be taken as a legal restatement of v. 3. That is, the wife has the power over the husband to define conjugal rights and the husband has the power over the wife to define conjugal right.”⁶⁹

(1) σώματος

It is the genitive singular of the neuter noun σῶμα meaning “body, a living body, a person, individual.”⁷⁰ σῶμα refers to the visible, tangible, biological part of the human being. More than that, σῶμα refers to the intimate social network that defines the

⁶⁷Alexander Sand, “ἀποδίδωμι,” *EDNT I* (1990): 128.

⁶⁸Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, Student Edition. eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy (London/ New York: Geoffrey Chapman, 1993), 804.

⁶⁹Snyder, “First Corinthians,” 93.

⁷⁰Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 399

person (ψυχή).⁷¹ The human being does not merely have a σῶμα, rather he/she is a σῶμα. It is a way of saying “self.” In 1 Cor 7 Paul shows that human sexuality is a “bodily” reality; it belongs to human insofar as he is σῶμα. According to Collins, “[h]ad Paul a negative view of human sexuality he would undoubtedly have described human sexuality in terms of the flesh (*sarx*).”⁷² Just as σάρξ “indicates man in his proneness to sin; whereas, the description of man as body indicates man in his creatureliness, in his openness to redemption and resurrection.”⁷³ The nature of one’s body is a gift from God, given through human relationships. At the center of God’s gift stands sexual intimacy. And because marital sexual relationship is so central to personality formation, early Christians protected it carefully. Thus, Paul struggles at the thought of some Corinthians of allowing marriage, but deny sexual intercourse.

(2) ἐξουσιάζει

It is third person, singular, present, active indicative of ἐξουσιάζω, meaning “to have or exercise power or authority over any one.”⁷⁴ It is a generic term which is used in a wide range of meanings. In the NT, the word appears 102 times. Of the vast majority of references of ἐξουσιάζω in the NT, about 85% of them, have the ordinary meaning of ‘any power that someone has, or the impersonal capacity for action which is bestowed by an office.’⁷⁵ The word generally bears the sense of authorization, legitimation, permission, sanction, right to exercise power. It also means moral

⁷¹ Snyder, “First Corinthians,” 93.

⁷² Raymond F. Collins, *Christian Morality: Biblical Foundations* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986), 196.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 152.

⁷⁵ Arnold T. Monera, Paul and “The Powers That Be”: An Exegesis of Romans 13, 1-7 (Doctoral dissertation in Sacred Theology: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2002), 191.

authority, influence.⁷⁶ But in 1 Cor 7:4a, it can be translated as “to have authority over one’s spouse.”

Verse 5

- a. μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους,
- b. εἰ μήτι ἂν ἐκ συμφώνου πρὸς καιρόν
- c. ἵνα σχολάσητε τῇ προσευχῇ
- d. καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦτε,
- e. ἵνα μὴ πειράζη ὑμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς
- f. διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν ὑμῶν.

- a. Do not deprive one another,
- b. except by mutual agreement for a set time
- c. that you may devote to prayer
- d. and then be together again
- e. so that Satan might not attempt you
- f. because of your lack of self-control.

(1) ἀποστερεῖτε

It is second person, plural, present, active, imperative of ἀποστερέω, meaning to ‘deprive, detach, to refuse or ‘steal and rob.’ From two Greek words ἀπό- and στερέω: ‘to deprive.’⁷⁷ For married people to refuse oneself from one spouse is hardly ideal. Within marriage, one does not have the right to refuse normal sexual relationships from his or her mate. In order to withdraw sexually from marriage, there must be mutual consent for a limited period of time for the sake of fasting and prayer.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ *Ibid*, 191.

⁷⁷ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 48; Jan-Adolf, Bühner, “ἀποστερέω,” *EDNT* I (1990): 142.

⁷⁸ The fact that fasting and prayer is involved during the time of separation means a relatively short period of time.

(2) συμφώνου

It is genitive, singular, neuter of σύμφωνος meaning ‘accordant, harmonious, and agreeing.’ It is better translated as ‘mutual consent/agreement.’ The preposition ἐκ with genitive συμφώνου in v.5b expresses cause and, hence, can be translated as ‘by (mutual) consent/by agreement.’ Although this phrase occurs frequently in the papyri in reference to contractual arrangement, in v.5b, Paul uses it of the mutual agreement between husband and wife.⁷⁹

(3) καιρόν

Accusative, singular, masculine noun of καιρός, meaning “a limited period of time marked by a suitability of circumstances, a fitting reason.”⁸⁰ In Paul’s letters, “καιρός belongs together with χρόνος and αἰών in the Pauline field for ‘time’.”⁸¹ In fact, they are used partially as synonyms. χρόνος designates a ‘period of time’ in the linear sense, while καιρός refers to ‘eschatologically filled time or time for decision’. In v.7b, an indefinite period of time is what is referred to.⁸² In 1 Cor 7, sexual abstinence, even when agreed upon for the sake of prayer, is tolerable only for a time.

(4) σχολάσητε

It is second person, plural, aorist, active subject of σχολάζω, meaning “to be unemployed, to be at leisure, to devote one’s self entirely to a thing.”⁸³ In v.5c, σχολάσητε τῇ προσευχῇ can be translated as “devote oneself to prayer.”⁸⁴

⁷⁹ Winfried Elliger, “σύμφωνος,” *EDNT* 3 (1993): 289-292, esp. 290.

⁸⁰ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 216.

⁸¹ Jörg Baumgarten, “καιρός,” *EDNT* 2 (1991): 232-235, esp. 232.

⁸² Baumgarten, “καιρός,” *EDNT* 2, 232-233.

⁸³ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 398.

⁸⁴ Walter Radl, “σχολάζω,” *EDNT* 3 (1993): 318-321, esp. 319.

(5) προσευχή

It is dative, singular, feminine noun προσευχή, meaning ‘prayer’ or ‘a place where prayer is offered’ or ‘an oratory.’⁸⁵ In v.5c, sexual abstinence may be allowed by mutual agreement for the sake of prayer and fasting. According to Horst Balz, in order to counter ascetic impulses among the Corinthians, Paul asserts that prayer and marital status are not mutually exclusive and each should be accorded its own place and time.⁸⁶ In the context of v.5, Paul simply means that there is a time for having intercourse with one’s wife, and a time to abstain for the purpose of prayer.⁸⁷ Abstinence is tolerable only in the pursuit of a greater good and in the passage under scrutiny, for the purpose of prayer.

(6) ἀκρασίαν

It is accusative, singular, feminine noun ἀκρασία, meaning “unruly appetite, lustfulness, lack of self-control.”⁸⁸ Here in v.5f, ἀκρασία is to be understood “in the sense of irrepressible desire for sexual relations.”⁸⁹ Satan might tempt the couple when they lack ἀκρασία or self-control.

Verse 6

a. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω κατὰ συγγνώμην

b. οὐ κατ’ ἐπιταγήν.

a. But this I say by way of concession

b. not by way of command.

⁸⁵ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 352.

⁸⁶ Horst Balz, “προσευχή,” *EDNT* 3 (1993): 164-169, esp.168.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 13.

⁸⁹ Rogers & Rogers, *New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament*, 361.

(1) συγγνώμην

It is accusative, singular, feminine noun συγγνώμη, meaning “pardon; concession, leave, and permission.”⁹⁰ κατὰ συγγνώμην is translated as ‘by way of concession or permission.’ Paul advocated celibacy for Christians, but allowed marriage, as a concession, when people could not control themselves. Collins notes that “[t]he concession of temporary abstinence is a clear indication that Paul considers human sexuality and its exercise within the marital context to be basically good.”⁹¹

(2) ἐπιταγήν

It is accusative, singular, feminine noun of ἐπιταγή meaning ‘injunction, command, a decree, authoritativeness, strictness.’⁹² οὐ κατ’ ἐπιταγήν can be translated as ‘not by way of command.’ According to Gordon Fee, temporary abstinence from sex for the purpose of prayer is not a command (ἐπιταγή), but a concession.⁹³

Verse 7

a. θέλω δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν

b. ἀλλὰ ἕαστος ἴδιον ἔχει χάρισμα ἐκ θεοῦ

c. ὁ μὲν οὕτως

d. ὁ δὲ οὕτως.

a. I wish yet all to be as myself

b. but each has a particular gift from God

⁹⁰ Perschbacher, *The New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 381.

⁹¹ Collins, *Christian Morality*, 197.

⁹² *Ibid*, 167.

⁹³ Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 283-284.

- c. one in this kind,
- d. another in that kind.

(1) θέλω - ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν

First person singular present indicative active, “to wish,” “to desire.” Paul is here making his personal wish: “I would like everyone to be as I am myself” (ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν). Paul is wishing that all readers were as he is, though he recognizes that different people receive different gifts from God. What was Paul’s situation or status then? At the time of his writing, according to Rogers and Rogers, Paul “may have been unmarried, a widower, or his wife may have left him and returned to his family because of his conversion to Christianity.”⁹⁴ The spirit behind his wish in 7:7 may “have been prompted by the idea that the unmarried person is able to devote undivided attention to the Lord.”⁹⁵ Paul gave no reason why he wished all to be like him, but he conceded that this is not for everyone.⁹⁶ Yet Paul himself prefers being single as the most suited way of life to serve God.

(2) χάρισμα

χάρισμα is accusative, singular, neuter noun, meaning “a free gift or a divinely conferred endowment.”⁹⁷ Paul recognizes the fact that God has called us “to live, whether married, widowed or single, in the kind of devotion to the Lord that

⁹⁴ Rogers & Rogers, *New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament*, 361.

⁹⁵ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 260.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 260.

⁹⁷ Perschbacher, *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, 437.

corresponds to God's work in one's life and reflect God's character."⁹⁸ But Paul's celibacy is a *χάρισμα* (gift) from God that is not a requirement for all.

3. Syntactic Analysis of 1 Cor 7:1-7

As the basic concern is to know what the passage actually means the focus in this section shall be on syntaxes, which is the arrangement of words and phrases to create well-formed sentences in a language. This portion of the linguistic analysis wants to see how the statements in 1 Cor 7:1-7 relate to one another to form a cohesive argument. Can we find parallels in Jewish, pagan, and Christian literature? What literary features do the passage betray? What is Paul's line of thought in this passage?

a. Some Syntactical Observation

(1) Certain words like *γυνή* (six times in different forms), *ανήρ* (five times in different forms), *άνθρωπος* (twice), *έχω* (twice), *έξουσιάζω* (twice) are repeated a number of times in the whole passage. Repetition of words plays a decisive role in the interpretation of the text. These repeated words or phrases usually indicate the subject matter of the pericope. They are indicators of importance, integration and intensification.⁹⁹

(2) 1 Cor 7:1-7 is admonitory and exhortatory. Paul is reacting and warning the Corinthians about a wrong oversight or behavior. The Apostle employs the

⁹⁸ S. J. Hafemann, "Letters to the Corinthians," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, Daniel G. Reid (Downers Grove, IL/Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 165-166.

⁹⁹ Arnold T. Monera, "Paul and 'The Powers That Be': An Exegesis of Romans 13, 1-7," 298-304.

imperative mood to urge them to act properly: ἔχέτω (“have” - twice in v. 2), ἀποδιδότω (“render” / “pay” - v. 3), ἀποστερεῖτε (“deprive” - v. 5).

(3) It is syntactically observable that within the passage the different units are connected generally through the use of the coordinating conjunction δέ (“but, and, now”).

v. 1a ... περὶ δε ὧν ἐγράψατε

v. 2a ... διὰ δε τὰς πορνείας

v. 3b ... ὁμοίως δε καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρὶ

v. 4c ... ὁμοίως δε καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει

v. 6a ... τοῦτο δε λέγω κατὰ συγγνώμην

v. 7a ... θέλω δε πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτὸν

The connective or adversative particle δέ is used: (a) to suggest a contrast that is unexpected in light of the first clause: “It is well for a man not to touch a woman” [v. 1b], “but because of sexual immorality” [v. 2a]; (b) to suggest in an affirmative sense what the first part of the sentence implied in a negative way: “for the wife does not have authority over her body [v. 4a], but the husband does” [v. 4b]; (c) to connect two ideas with the meaning of “with the exception of”: “I wish that all were as I myself am [v. 7a], but each has a particular gift from God” [v. 7b].”

(4) 1 Cor 7:1 begins with the formula περὶ δέ, usually translated as “Concerning”. Several studies have been made on the significance of the epistolographic formula περὶ δέ.¹⁰⁰ Results of these studies could be summarized as

¹⁰⁰ See for instance, C.E. Faw, “On the Writing of First Thessalonians,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71 (1952): 217-225; Margaret M. Mitchell, “Concerning περὶ δέ in 1 Corinthians,” *Novum Testamentum* 31 (1989): 229-256; Arnold T. Monera, “Glossolalia and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians,” 4; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 5.

follow: (a) $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is a formula of reply to specific questions or problems, especially where there is a series of such; (b) in series of replies it is properly used to introduce those from the second point forward; (c) in Pauline usage it is confined to the answering of specific questions or problems brought up in letter from the churches to which he is writing.¹⁰¹ The presence of $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in 1 Cor 7:1 signals to the readers that Paul is responding to the letter that the Corinthian Christian community had written him: “Concerning [$\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$] the matters about which you wrote.” Besides 1 Cor 7:1, this formula serving as topic marker occurs also in 1 Cor 7:25, 8:1, 12:1, 16:1 and 16:12. According to J. C. Hurd, “The fact that this formula occurs six times in the last ten chapters of 1 Corinthians...emphasizes its importance to the structure of 1 Corinthians.”¹⁰² The formula serves to introduce an answer by Paul to the Corinthian queries. Thus each time $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is used it ought to be understood in reference to the Corinthians’ letter of 7:1 to which Paul now responds point by point in its order. It is of interest to note that the plural $\acute{\omega}\nu$ in 1 Cor 7:1 signifies several topics which Paul wishes to treat point by point.

b. Structure of 1 Cor 7:1-7

The foregoing discussion on $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ 1 Cor 7:1 makes it clear that one of the issues the Corinthians inquired in their letter ($\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\tau\epsilon$) to Paul had to do with marriage and human sexuality. This is what Paul treats in the whole chapter which can

¹⁰¹ Faw, “On the Writing of First Thessalonians,” 221.

¹⁰² J. C. Hurd Jr, *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (London: SPCK, 1965): 62.

be considered a literary unit. Collins has identified a chiasmic pattern running through in chapter 7 as follows¹⁰³:

A – Issues relating to the sexual life of those who are or had been married (7:1-16)

B – Social Stability (7:17-24)

A' -- Issues relating to the sexual life of those who are not yet married (7:25-40)

Jerome Murphy O'Connor, on his part, sees the structure of 1 Cor 7¹⁰⁴ subdivided into:

7:1-7	Sex Within Marriage (between Husbands and Wives)
7:8-9	About Widowers and Widows
7:10-16	Marriage and Divorce
7:17-24	Changes in Social Status
7:25-40	Changes in Sexual Status

There is certainty that the issue in 7:1-7, a self-contained literary unit, is an issue provoked by an inquiry from the Corinthian community. It is important to discern in this literary unit what the Corinthians actually asked and Paul's response to them.

c. Paul's Line of Thought

Traditional Interpretation of v. 1b. The traditional interpretation generally considered 1 Cor 7:1b to be an expression of Paul's own thought. The Apostle Paul being a celibate was thought to have "urged the Corinthian men to espouse a fairly strong sexual asceticism."¹⁰⁵ Thus, the pericope had been understood, according to

¹⁰³ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 15.

¹⁰⁴ Murphy O'Connor, "The First Letter to the Corinthians," 799.

¹⁰⁵ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 252.

Snyder, “as an authoritative call to celibacy, or at the least a reluctant permission to marry.”¹⁰⁶ This radically ascetic (i.e., “encratite”) interpretation, however, contradicts Paul’s otherwise positive evaluation of marriage and contrary to the positive biblical understanding of the body (σῶμα). The New International Version (NIV) renders v. 1b as: “It is good for a man not to marry.” This interpretation however, is not at all what v. 1b is saying here. The original language used here is not implying marriage, but is referring to a man having actual sexual intercourse with his wife. Many people throughout history have found in these supposed words of Paul the justification of single, celibate life as more holy life than the married state. For instance, the writings of the second-century apologist Tatian used this passage from Paul to endorse compulsory sexual renunciation.¹⁰⁷

New Interpretation of v. 1b. Today there is a consensus among commentators that 1 Cor 7:1b (“It is good for a man not to touch a woman”) represents the viewpoint of some Corinthians rather than Paul’s opinion. Formally, v. 1b belongs with v. 1a since it is one of the matters about which the Corinthian church wrote. The famous but controversial statement, “It is well for a man not to touch a woman”, is actually a Corinthian slogan. As already seen in the word analysis, the word “touch” (ἅπτομαι / ἅπτεσθαι) was used in the ancient world as a euphemism for sexual intercourse. The expegetical infinitive ἅπτεσθαι explains what is καλόν. Thus, v. 1b can be appropriately translated as, “It is good for a man not to have sexual intercourse with [his] wife.” The rendering of γυνή as “wife” instead of simply “woman” is possible.

¹⁰⁶ Snyder, *First Corinthians*, 89.

¹⁰⁷ For more information, see David G. Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Jovinianist Controversy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

In Greek marriage language a “woman” is referred to as “wife.”¹⁰⁸ This slogan expresses what some Corinthians believed in. As Collins explains, “It encapsulates a type of sexual asceticism that some people at Corinth found to be so problematic that they wrote to Paul about it.”¹⁰⁹ In concrete, some Corinthians idealistically thought that married couples should abstain from sexual relations.¹¹⁰ That it is a slogan is indicated by the formulaic nature of the expression, “it is good/well for a man to...” (καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ). Verse 1b is just one of the many slogans from the Corinthians that Paul had to deal with in this letter (see 1 Cor 6:12, 13; 8:1, 4, 8; 10:23; 13:2; 15:12). Does Paul agree with the Corinthian slogans all the time? In the case of 1 Cor 7:1b, since perhaps the Corinthians knew Paul’s preference for the celibate life, some of them at least confidently expected Paul to agree.¹¹¹

Paul’s clear argumentation in 1 Cor 7:2-5 rejects their plea for sexual asceticism.¹¹² Let us now try to reconstruct his line of thought based on Paul’s rhetorical argument in 1 Cor 7:1-7.

(1) Talbert offers a concentric pattern (ABCC’B’A’) in Paul’s argumentation in vv. 2-5 in favor of marital relations:

A. Possible acts of immorality (v. 2)

B. Sexual union is all right (v. 3)

C. Dependence of the woman on the man (v. 4ab)

¹⁰⁸ The rendering of γυνή in 7:1b as “wife” follows a well-established first-century semantic convention. See E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 86-88.

¹⁰⁹ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 252.

¹¹⁰ Hurd, *Origin of 1 Corinthians*, 68.

¹¹¹ F. F. Bruce, *Apostle of the Heart Set Free* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, repr. 1991), 267.

¹¹² William E. Phipps, “Paul’s Attitude towards Sexual Relations,” *New Testament Studies* 28 (1982):125-131, esp. 126.

C'. Dependence of the man on the woman (v. 4cd)

B'. Sexual union is encouraged, except for special reason, and then only temporarily (v. 5abcd)

A'. Temptation to immorality (v. 5ef)¹¹³

According to Talbert, in A (v. 2) and A' (v. 5ef) Paul contradicts the demand for celibacy of some Corinthians with the reality of sexual desire among Christians, which, if not satisfied within marriage, “runs the risk of opening the door to Satan and of leading to immorality.”¹¹⁴ In B (v. 3) and B' (v. 5abcd) “Paul affirms the goodness of sexual relations within marriage (v. 3) and does not approve abstinence within marriage except by mutual agreement, during a temporary period, for prayer (v. 5).”¹¹⁵ In C (v. 4ab) C' (v. 4cd) “the apostle describes the mutual dependence of each partner on the other: ‘the wife does not rule over her own body, but the husband does; likewise the husband does not rule over his own body, but the wife does’ (v.4).”¹¹⁶ In short, responding to the Corinthian ascetics, the Apostle Paul affirms the goodness of sexual relations within the context of marriage and allows abstinence only for a limited time by mutual consent.

(2) The use of superordinating conjunction *δέ* (‘but’) in v. 2a has a strong adversative force. It expresses Paul’s disagreement with the proposition quoted in v. 1b. Their idea of sexual asceticism runs counter to “Paul’s Jewish heritage, to Jesus, to Paul’s theological assumptions (e.g., creation).¹¹⁷

¹¹³ Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 38.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 39.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 37.

(3) The Greek phrase διὰ τὰς πορνείας in v. 2a, translated as *because of sexual immorality*, means literally, ‘owing to fornications’, which refers to “the numerous acts and varied temptations which abounded at Corinth.”¹¹⁸ The phrase is to be understood in the light of the similar phrase in v. 5f - διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν ὑμῶν (because of your lack of self-control), since it can refer to extramarital sexual intercourse in the context of Paul’s conceding temporary abstinence for married couples. It is likely that διὰ τὰς πορνείας in v. 2a has a direct reference to 6:12-20, where married men were going to the πορναί (probably the temple prostitutes).¹¹⁹ It is a known fact that the old Corinth gained a reputation for sexual vice that the verb κορινθιάζω (which means *to act like a Corinthian*, i.e., to commit fornication) was coined.¹²⁰ This plethora of sexual temptation and promiscuity that made the city notorious inevitably produced a general opposition to marriage as “a reaction against the licentious manners which reigned in that city.”¹²¹ Surely Christians in Corinth were surrounded by sexual temptations. They were in turmoil because of the immorality of the culture around them.

(4) Paul is not anti-sex, but pro-marriage and married couple should not abstain from sexual union without any reason. In v. 2bc Paul insists on monogamous marriage: “Each man should have his own wife; and each woman her own husband.” Paul is here not advocating “a universal obligation of marriage.”¹²² Verse 2 is not a command to all single people to get married but rather a command for those who are already married to

¹¹⁸ F. Godet, *Commentary on St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Vol. 1 (London: T. & T. Clark, 1889), 322; cited by David Prior, *The Message of 1 Corinthians*, The Bible Speaks Today, ed. John Stott (Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 1993, repr. 2008), 115.

¹¹⁹ Gordon D. Fee, “1 Corinthians 7:1 in the NIV,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23/4 (1980): 307-314, esp. 311; G. Fitzler, “πορνείας,” *EDNT* 3 (1992): 137-139.

¹²⁰ Monera, “Glossolalia and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians 14,” 1.

¹²¹ Godet, *Commentary on St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 317.

¹²² Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1998), 96.

have active sexual relationship. Alfred Martin, commenting on our text, writes: “Sex as given by God is to be experienced within marriage, not before it or outside of it, and obviously for one *man* and one *woman*.¹²³ This is further confirmed by his use of the verb “to have” (ἔχω; Paul uses the imperative ἐχέτω = “must have”) in v. 2 which is another euphemism for sexual relations. Bruce Winter explains, “the word ‘have’ carried the same connotations in the ancient world as it does in the present-day marriage service, where the presumption of sexual consent and sexual intercourse is expressed in the sentence ‘to have and to hold from this day forward’.”¹²⁴ Note that the Greek word ἐχέτω is a present active command that also implies “keep”.

(5) In verse 3 Paul explains each spouse’s sexual responsibilities in marriage. The husband must fulfill his duty to his wife, and likewise also the wife to her husband. Husband and wife belong to each other. The basis of this conjugal (sexual) rights/duty is their mutual “authority” (ἐξουσιάζω) over each other’s bodies (v. 4). The word ἀποδιδότω (“fulfill”), which is present active imperative, means “to make full,” “to bring to completion,” “to develop the full potential.” This implies that both couple must ensure each partner is fully satisfied and vice versa. Sexual Activity is no mere delight, but it is also a duty, an obligation (ὀφειλή).¹²⁵ A duty is a moral or legal responsibility that arises from one’s position. It is the duty of each married person to meet the sexual needs of his or her partner. Husband and wife are to render each other *due benevolence*.¹²⁶

¹²³ Alfred Martin, *First Corinthians* (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1989), 70.

¹²⁴ Bruce W. Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2001), 227.

¹²⁵ Rogers & Rogers, *The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament*, 361.

¹²⁶ See G. Colemann Luck, *First Corinthians* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1958). Cited in Martin, *First Corinthians*, 72.

(6) Verse 4, according to Prior, “is one of the several passages where Paul explicitly talks of rights; and, so far from being any kind of male chauvinist, he accords to the wife precisely the same rights to enjoy her husband’s body as he accords to the husband.”¹²⁷ Paul’s whole approach to marriage relationship is one of equality and mutuality – an approach that was completely revolutionary in Paul’s day.¹²⁸ This seems to be a missing ingredient in the sexually haphazard culture around us today.

(7) In verse 5, according to Alfred Martin, married partners are not to deprive one another, certainly not on a unilateral basis and the married person who does not find sexual satisfaction with his or her spouse will be much more likely to sin.¹²⁹ Marriage involves mutual responsibilities and conjugal rights. The desire of one partner to forgo sex must always take into consideration and respect the conjugal rights of the other. Simply, a married couple cannot claim to have authority over his/her body.¹³⁰ The purpose for abstinence from sexual relationship is also clearly defined in v.5c, i.e., prayer and presumably fasting. But it is only for a limited time by mutual agreement by both spouses. And there must be a return to normal sexual relations to avoid temptations Satan and the lack of self-control on the part of either partner if abstinence is prolonged.¹³¹

(8) According to Bruce, the neuter pronoun τοῦτο in verse 6 cannot be referring to the plurality of commands in 7:2-5, since τοῦτο is not plural (ταῦτα). τοῦτο is positioned at the beginning of the sentence and used to emphasize what Paul is about

¹²⁷ Prior, *The Message of 1 Corinthians*, 116.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

¹²⁹ Martin, *First Corinthians*, 72.

¹³⁰ Carl J. Laney, “Paul and the Permanence of Marriage in 1 Corinthians 7,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* (1982): 283-294. 284.

¹³¹ Bruce, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 230.

to say, which is not a command. Therefore, τοῦτο of 7:6 must refer to a single phenomenon and the referent of the neuter demonstrative pronoun is forward looking, and its place in the sentence furthers the emphatic nature of Paul's concessive comment in v.7.¹³²

(9) V.7a reads "I wish all to be as myself." These words, according to Talbert, are obviously Paul's own.¹³³ Paul's personal preference would be for them to be single like him, and that it is good if unmarried people and widows are able to remain as they are. Further, he expects his own unmarried status to serve as an example for others, who wish to imitate him. Nevertheless, Paul is mindful that not every Corinthian has the capability of self-control required for living a chaste life as a single person. For Paul, it is wrong to demand a life of continence from those who do not have the special gift from God to lead such a life. Moreover, Paul also acknowledged that God's will is not the same for all in this matter. Viewed in the overall context of vv.1-7, it is simply using to advantage the state in which one finds oneself.¹³⁴

On the whole, the passage is all about human sexual morality. Paul urges Corinthians to have a realistic attitude toward it. He offers advice on his own authority, reflecting a Jewish tradition to which he and the rabbis were heirs.¹³⁵ Physical-sexual relations are not to be denied in their rightful place within marriage. Paul views this relation analogous to the union between Christ and the believer (see Eph 5:31-32).¹³⁶

¹³² *Ibid.*, 238.

¹³³ Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 39.

¹³⁴ Martin, *First Corinthians*, 73.

¹³⁵ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 257.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

In the understanding of Paul, sexual relationships find full their meaning only when they are exercised within marriage. Sexual morality is introduced and emphasized as the basic criterion to evaluate all marital activities, especially the obligations and responsibilities of marriage.

In 1 Cor 7, Paul does not condemn nor devalue marriage. He is, in fact, correcting Corinthian's misunderstanding of marriage life. Paul recommends to the Corinthians that it is best to remain in the social status in which God called them, whether married or unmarried, slave or free.¹³⁷ Paul is also convinced that the ability to remain unmarried is charism, a gift of chastity and total continence given by God only to some. He is concerned for "their doctrinal authenticity and for their moral consistency, for their faith and for their life, for their leadership and for the new converts."¹³⁸ Paul wants the Corinthians to believe correctly and practice accordingly. Thus 1 Cor 7:1-7 is context-specific. That is the reason why he writes his letters to them and why he "discusses one-sided or misleading beliefs that some (Corinthians) Christians propagate."¹³⁹

¹³⁷ Bruce J. Malina and John J. Pilch, *Social-Science Commentary on the Letter of Paul* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 57-130, esp. 85ff.

¹³⁸ Eckhard Schnabel J., *Paul the Missionary: Realities, Strategies, and Methods* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 207.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*

CHAPTER THREE

THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF 1 COR 7:1-7

In this last chapter, as the focus is on the appropriation of the passage in contemporary times, the investigation is how the passage can be implied in today's context regarding human sexuality and moral issues.

1. Christians Today and Corinthian Christians: Attitude toward sexuality

Present-day Christians are no different from the Corinthian Christians in Paul's times. Attitude toward sexuality is a good case in point. The similarities and correspondences between the church in the ancient Corinth and the Church in our days are surprisingly real. There are differences, however, as the Corinthian church was a specific historical instance. While trying to understand how Corinthians thought about human sexuality, it is imperative not to overlook the historical situations of the time in which they were influenced by both Paul's teachings and the surrounding pagan practices.

Hence, the context in which the Corinthians' sexual issues was addressed must first be considered because Paul's teaching on sexual morality can be only understood rightly with the context in which it was actually formulated.¹⁴⁰ Influenced by Gnosticism and early expectation of an imminent *Parousia*, some Corinthians denounced all, but total abstinence from sexually related issues. Thus, these situational

¹⁴⁰ Collins, *Christian Morality: Biblical Foundations*, 149.

realities of Hellenistic dualism and Christian expectation of an imminent *Parousia* are elements of the backgrounds of Paul and Corinthian correspondences on human sexuality.¹⁴¹

According to Patristics scholar John O’Keefe, the Corinthian believers expected Jesus to return soon and, hence, cared little about the maintenance of social institution like marriage, while Jesus envisioned a kingdom of God that similarly lacked the structure of life taken for granted today.¹⁴² Some Corinthians turned to ascetic practices in imitation of Christ because they believed “that through their practices of physical renunciation they could begin to live now in anticipation of the way we will live after the resurrection.”¹⁴³ Collins considers that within this perspective of the historical context of 1 Cor 7:1-7 and Paul’s immediate concerns, we can know Paul’s understanding of human sexuality and responsibility and his view on marriage.¹⁴⁴ Dunn similarly comments: “[as] the community in Corinth was only in process of developing its distinctly Christian character.....(there were) strains and stresses (eschatological tension) between the new loyalty to Christ and the still continuing loyalties to unbelieving spouse or master were evidently quite severe and stressful.”¹⁴⁵ It is in such circumstance that Paul could not dictate a theology of marriage unrelated to Corinthians’ actual situations. Likewise, David F. Wright notes: “Paul never addressed

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 195.

¹⁴² John O’ Keefe, “Marriage is Good, Celibacy is Better,” in *Marriage in the Catholic Tradition: Scripture, Tradition, and Experience*, eds. Todd A. Salzman, Thomas M. Kelly, and John J. O’Keefe (New York, NY: Crossroad, 2004), 76-85, esp. 78.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁴ Collins, *Christian Morality: Biblical Foundations*, 196.

¹⁴⁵ Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 695.

the subject of human sexuality in a systematic manner, but said much about it in response to particular questions.”¹⁴⁶

Paul’s premises, according to another Pauline commentator Marrow, are difficult for those who view human sexuality through “the theological, philosophical, or humanistic theories that have shaped the Christian understanding of the institution (of marriage) over the centuries.”¹⁴⁷ In addition, these views are at odds with contemporary way of thinking. We should, however, Marrow notes, keep in mind that “what Paul has to say about the subject of marriage is not only realistic but also guided throughout by a profound understanding of the mystery of the death and resurrection of Christ for us.”¹⁴⁸

Concerning the meaning and value of marriage, there were some controversies in the ancient Christian Church. Almost all patristic writers consider sexual abstinence as higher on the scale of Christian values than marriages. But they diverge considerably from each other in the weight they lend to this preference.¹⁴⁹ For instance, Clement of Alexandria said that marital sex is only for the purpose of begetting children and sex must be undertaken without desire.¹⁵⁰ Likewise, procreation in marriage is fundamental

¹⁴⁶ David F. Wright, “Sexuality, Sexual Ethics,” *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, Daniel G. Reid: *A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship* (Illinois/Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1993), 871-875, esp. 871.

¹⁴⁷ Stanley B. Marrow, “Marriage and Divorce in the New Testament,” *Anglican Theological Review* 70.1(1988): 3-15, esp. 4.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁹ Julie Hanlon Rubio, “Jesus, Paul, and Family Values,” *Ex Auditu* 28/1 (2012): 45-69., esp. 55. *igion Database with ATLA Serials, EBSCOhost* (accessed May 6, 2015).

¹⁵⁰ ‘The law intended husbands to cohabit with their wives with self-control and only for the purpose of begetting children.’ and ‘A man who marries for the sake of begetting children must practice continence so that it is not desire he feels for his wife.....that he may beget children with a chaste and controlled will.’ Clement of Alexandria, “On marriage: miscellanies,” Book 3, in *Alexandrian Christianity*, ed. John Ernest Leonard Oulton and Henry Chadwick; vol. 2 of *the Library of Christian Classics*, ed. John Baillie (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954): 71, 58. Some limit scriptural

to St. Augustine's understanding of marriage. St. Augustine argues that marriage is good since conjugal chastity makes good use of evil concupiscence in the procreation of children, explaining that through marriage something good (offspring) can come of something evil (concupiscence).¹⁵¹ St. Thomas Aquinas also concludes his discussion about marriage with a quotation from St. Augustine; "All the goods of marriage are fulfilled in these parents of Christ: offspring, fidelity, and sacrament. The offspring we know to have been the Lord Jesus himself; fidelity, because there was no adultery; sacrament, because there was no divorce. Only marital intercourse was not present there."¹⁵²

Today, the decline of sexual moralities in many societies can be clearly illustrated. Social realities and economic factors are among the most significant elements in the shaping of Christian understanding of sexual morality at present. Through the ages, the concept of marriage has taken a great number of forms. Despite appreciation of the values of relationship, fidelity, and the dignity of both spouses, it is clear that Christian marriage today are largely shaped by the social realities of present times.

In his Apostolic Exhortation entitled *Evangelii Gaudium*, Pope Francis admits that "the family is experiencing a profound cultural crisis, as are all communities and

analysis of marriage to a few positive texts in order to support a strong defense of holy family and support its private obligations. Others use negative texts to support celibacy for the most devoted faithful.

¹⁵¹ Heith-Stade David, "Marriage in the canons of the council in Trullo," *Studia Theologica* 64, no. 1 (June 2010): 4-21, esp. 7. *Academic Search Complete*, EBSCOhost (accessed April 28, 2015).

¹⁵² Kwasniewski Peter, "St. Thomas on the Grandeur and Limitations of Marriage." *Nova Et Vetera* 10/2, 2012: 415-436, esp. 418. *Academic Search Complete*, EBSCOhost (accessed April 28, 2015).

social bonds,”¹⁵³ The Holy Father also concedes that “marriage now tends to be viewed as a form of mere emotional satisfaction that can be constructed in any way or modified at will.”¹⁵⁴ For Pope Francis, the necessary contribution of marriage to society should surpass the feelings and momentary needs of the couple, explaining by quoting the teaching of French bishops that marriage is “not born of loving sentiment, ephemeral by definition, but from the depth of the obligation assumed by the spouses who accept to enter a total communion of life.”¹⁵⁵ It is true for Paul as well. For Paul, human sexuality is meaningful only with respect to marriage and procreation, and thus, the marital relationship will be explicable.

2. Values of Human Sexuality and Sexual Responsibility

In 1 Corinthians, “Paul’s concern is with the right use of human sexuality; nowhere is there the slightest hint that indicates that human sexuality is evil.”¹⁵⁶ Paul’s attitude towards sexual intercourse in 1 Cor 7:3-5 has to be understood by means of awareness of man’s existence in the Lord and in His Spirit since Paul emphasized the holiness of man’s bodily and sexual existence.¹⁵⁷ In the understanding of Paul, the human being does not merely have a $\sigma\hat{\omega}\mu\alpha$ (body), but rather he/she is a *bodily* reality. Therefore, when he/she sins sexually, he/she sins against his/her own *body* (see 1Cor

¹⁵³ Francis, *Evangelii Gaudium*, (Apostolic exhortation to the Bishops, Clergy, Consecrated Persons and the Lay Faithful on the Proclamation of the Gospel in Today’s World), 61-57, esp. 66. http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html#Some_cultural_challenges (Accessed 3/5/2015).

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁶ Collins, *Christian Morality: Biblical Foundations*, 196.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 197.

6:18), because “sexual intercourse is uniquely expressive of our whole *being*.”¹⁵⁸ As human persons, we are sexed, genital human beings. We are not only bodily human beings, but sexed human persons. Our body-soul is either essentially male, or female. Sexuality in general and sexual orientations in particular are parts of our nature, and not just an accidental but essential components. So, for Paul, “a human being *is* a body, rather than *has* a body. In the Corinthian context this is a way of speaking about a Christian both as a sexual being and as a being in Christ, a member of his church-body.”¹⁵⁹ In the Pauline ethic, Collins reasons, justifying rationale for indiscriminate sexual union with prostitutes is “contrary to the Christian vocation and the consecration of the Christian’s bodily person.”¹⁶⁰ So, in the understanding of Paul, the σῶμα (body) is considered as the temple of the Holy Spirit.

Like in our contemporary days, sexual sins such are fornication, impurity, licentiousness, and sexual perversion are common in the Corinthian church. For Paul, these sexual immoralities are “antithetical to the demands of the kingdom and the walking in the Spirit which ought to characterize the Christian’s way of life”¹⁶¹ because sexual activity embodies the whole person, desecrating a Christian’s bodily union with Christ.¹⁶²

Today, human sexuality and moral responsibility continue to be important and relevant particularly for Christians. Collins states that “although essentially a reality of

¹⁵⁸ Wright, “Sexuality, Sexual Ethics,” 872.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 872.

¹⁶⁰ Collins, *Christian Morality: Biblical Foundations*, 198.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² Wright, “Sexuality, Sexual Ethics,” 872.

the secular order, human sexuality is a sacral value by reason of the blessing which God pronounces upon the sexed humanity which He has created.”¹⁶³ In Marriage, the spouses commit themselves to a lifelong relationship. Sexual relation is not a dispensable dimension of marriage. Sexual intercourse is one of the mutual obligations of husband to wife and wife to husband, for within marriage neither partner retains sole ownership of his or her own body. It is “not merely reciprocal mutual love, respect and care but the union itself in which a couple’s becoming ‘one’s flesh’ is actualized.”¹⁶⁴ This analogy is comparable to the bonding between Christ and believers.¹⁶⁵ Hence, 1 Cor 7:1-7 totally justifies one aspect of marital life, i.e. parity between married couples.

The Catholic Church has a unique view of marriage as part of God's purpose for humanity. From its very beginnings, the Church has stressed the spiritual nature and indissolubility of marriage since she insists marriage as a sacrament instituted by Christ himself. In marriage, an indissoluble bond exists between a man and a woman by any means. *The Catechism of Catholic Church* teaches that God willed and created man and woman with the intention that they are made for each other to an intimate communion of life and of love in marriage. In marriage, God unites them in such a way that, by forming one flesh, they can transmit human life.¹⁶⁶ By procreation, man and woman as spouses and parents cooperate in a unique way in the God’s work of creation. In line with the *Magisterium of the Church*, the *Code of Canon Law* no.1055 states that the marriage covenant has been raised by Christ the Lord to the dignity of a sacrament. The

¹⁶³ Collins, *Christian Morality: Biblical Foundations*, 163.

¹⁶⁴ Wright, “Sexuality, Sexual Ethics,” 873.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁶ Catholic Truth Society, *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, no 337 (London: Publishers to the Holy See, 2006).

very nature of marriage is ordered to the well-being of the spouses and to the procreation and upbringing of children.¹⁶⁷

It is God's will of showing love for man and woman that He created them. At its deepest level, marriage is a personal-sexual-spiritual companionship ordained and instituted by God.¹⁶⁸ True marriage, like true sexuality, is good as long as it is part of God's plan. For Christian couples, marriage is a mystery, and a sacrament, that is, a sign and instrument of grace.¹⁶⁹ Christian marriage manifests Christ' unconditional love for the Church (Eph 5:25). The Christian couple is particularly committed to proclaim in their lives God's love to the world. As theologian Christopher West writes: "This means marriage is only marriage, and sex is only sex, to the extent that they participate in God's free, total, faithful, and fruitful love." This basic teaching helps solve the so many problems connected with sex and marriage.¹⁷⁰

3. Sexuality and Chastity/Sexual Moderation

In the early stage of Christianity, ascetic Gnostics, and perhaps some rigorous Christians, denounced human sexuality and marriage saying that "all sex is sinful, and

¹⁶⁷ "Code of Canon law," No.1055, §1, in *The Code of Cannon Law* (Pasay City, Philippines: Paulines Publishing House, 2001), 189.

¹⁶⁸ O.J. Baab, "MARRIAGE," In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopaedia*, Vol-3, ed George Arthur Buttrick (Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee), 278-287, esp. 286.

¹⁶⁹ Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (2005): 219
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/justpeace/documents/rc_pc_justpeace_doc_20060526_compendio-dott-soc_en.html (accessed on May, 9, 2015).

¹⁷⁰ Christopher West, *Good News about Sex and Marriage* (Cincinnati, Ohio: St. Anthony Messenger Press, 2004), 30.

thus, so must be marriage”¹⁷¹ and “others reject all of creation, including birth, sex and marriage.”¹⁷² This Gnostics’ position was based on a dualistic viewpoint: spiritual things are good and material things are bad, and so marriage is sinful.¹⁷³ Those views are long by gone.

Nowadays, sexual inclinations of the body are considered as natural and God’s gifts to human beings. Moreover, sexuality is an integral part of our human personality. So, we need to realize that sexuality is a path of true love of God, neighbor and ourselves. Yet our sexual passions may be expressed rationally and irrationally, rightly and wrongly because “sexual desire and emotional effectivity are part of the raw stuff out of which authentic human love can be shaped.”¹⁷⁴ Thus, to be able to order our sexual desires and emotional affectivity properly and reasonably, we all need moderation in general and the virtue of one kind of chastity in particular.¹⁷⁵

Chastity is synonymous with sexual purity and deeply connected with the virtue of modesty because “(it) is not a virtue for married persons alone, for the goods at stake in human sexuality need to be cherished and revered in every person’s life.”¹⁷⁶ There are different kinds of chastity: consecrated chastity, virginity/celibacy, conjugal chastity, widowed chastity and chastity of the single. Hence, the way in which chastity

¹⁷¹ David Dean Mimier King, “The Marriage Debate and 1 Corinthians 7, The Use of Paul in Patristic and Reformation Controversies over Marriage and Celibacy” (Master of Arts Thesis in Biblical Studies: Iliff School of Theology, Colorado, May/2011), 33.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*

¹⁷³ Gary J. Quinn, “A New Look at Christian Marriage” *Journal of Religion and Health* 10 (1971): 388-395, esp. 388.

¹⁷⁴ Ronald Lawler, OFM, Joseph Boyle and William May, *Catholic Sexual Ethics. A Summary, Explanation and Defense* (Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division, 1985):125.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 168.

is practiced varies, based on different states of life and vocations. For instance, genital actuation is only morally right within marriage; this actuation is also ordered by chastity. This conjugal chastity can be defined as “the total meaning of mutual self-giving and human procreation in the context of true love”¹⁷⁷ Paul would agree with this premise. Regarding premarital and extramarital intercourse are “based on the conviction that God’s revelation, as expressed in Scripture and tradition, unequivocally condemns it.”¹⁷⁸

Sex within marriage is chaste, for it is intended by God’s will and design of human sexuality. But to devote oneself for a particular purpose, such as prayer, moderation of sexual desires is required even in marriage. After a limited period of time, sexual relations are to be resumed, as it is a powerful drive which has ruined – and continues ruining the lives of many people, including priests and great professionals today. This is also Paul’s advice to the Corinthians because of sexual immoralities of that time.

The importance of chastity or moderation is regarded as essential element in maintaining and cultivating the unity of body with spirit, thus integrity of the human being. Marriage and virginity/celibacy are two ways of living God’s love in a Christian life as these are “two ways of expressing and living the one mystery of the covenant of God with his people. When marriage is not esteemed, neither can consecrated virginity or celibacy exist; when human sexuality is not regarded as great value given by the

¹⁷⁷ Pontifical Council for the Family, *Vademecum for Confessors*, No.2 (accessed on 10/5/2015), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/family/documents/rc_pc_family_doc_12021997_vademecum_en.html

¹⁷⁸ Ronald Lawler, *Catholic Sexual Ethics*, 169.

Creator, the renunciation of it for the sake of the Kingdom of Heaven loses its meaning.”¹⁷⁹

In summing up, Paul’s premise on human sexuality is a specific reply to the letter sent to him by the Corinthians. It is still applicable for the Christians today as the groundwork for Christian sexuality. The prevalent nature of sexual license of present days makes Paul’s teaching on sexual morality still relevant since sexual violence and attempts to live according to the Gospel in many modern societies are not too dissimilar to the multiethnic and cross-cultural society at the ancient Corinth.

Especially from a Christian perspective, it is also worthwhile to investigate Paul’s idea of marital issues since responsible sexual behavior in and out of marriage is a major issue in contemporary understanding of marital issues such as *living together* without the benefits of sacramental marriage are common in many societies. Above all, Paul’s stance on sexual discipline is “in every way healthier-spiritually, psychologically, physically-than alternatives offered and promoted today.”¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁹ John Paul II, *Familiaris Consortio*, [Apostolic Exhortation to the Episcopate to the Clergy and to the Faithful of the Whole Catholic Church on the Role of the Christian Family in the Modern World], 16. http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_19811122_familiaris-consortio.html (Accessed on 3/5/2015).

¹⁸⁰ Wright, “Sexuality, Sexual Ethics,” 874.

CONCLUSION

The Roman Stoic philosopher Seneca (4 BCE- 65 CE) said: “Every journey has an end.” I liken this whole process of practicum dissertation writing to an academic journey. Just like any journey, the road is not always straight, along the way one encounters bumpy roads, sometimes one takes a wrong detour and is lost, but thanks that along the way there are generous people willing to help so that the traveler gets back to the right direction. This dissertation comes to an end of the long journey. Let me conclude this humble work.

The subject matter of this paper is 1 Corinthians 7:1-7 where Paul treats an issue that seems problematic to the Corinthian Christian community. In order for us to fully understand Paul’s line of thought in 1 Cor 7:1-7, it is deemed best to situate the pericope within the wider context, i.e., within the whole letter. That was the purpose of the first chapter of this paper. The Pauline authorship of 1 Corinthians is uncontested. The letter was probably written around 55 C.E. while Paul was in Ephesus. The occasion of the letter was some disturbing information about the Christian community that Paul received from several sources. Besides oral report that he received from Chloe’s group (1 Cor 1:11), the Corinthian community sent the Apostle a letter of inquiry (7:1). This is confirmed in the use of the formula $\pi\epsilon\rho\lambda\grave{\iota}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in 7:1. There is a consensus among scholars that those themes beginning with $\pi\epsilon\rho\lambda\grave{\iota}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ from 1 Cor 7:1 onwards were issues the Corinthians asked in their letter to Paul. In short, the whole 1 Corinthians must be understood as an occasional letter directed to the immediate needs of the Corinthian converts. As a pastor, Paul was writing to deal with pressing problems.

The second chapter, the main section of this paper, deals specifically about the passage under scrutiny (i.e., 1 Cor 7:1-7). A lexical study of the pericope was done to

help in the proper understanding of Paul's line of thought. Paul begins the passage by quoting a slogan from the Corinthians' letter ("It is good for a man not to touch a woman") to which he did not agree and thus corrects. To "touch a woman" is a euphemism for sexual intercourse. Some people in the community were promoting or advocating sexual abstinence in the marriage relationship. But why would the Corinthians not be interested in sex in the context of marriage? 1 Cor 7:1-7 does not give us a direct answer. But the most likely suggestion given is the presence of ascetics in the community who believed they are already πνευματικοί ("spiritual" persons). These ascetics must have been influenced by Greek philosophical dualism that prioritizes the spirit over the body. Matter is evil and spirit is good. These people seemed to believe that the highest plane of spirituality is to forgo sex. For these πνευματικοί sexuality was part of a "fleshly", unspiritual existence. Could it be that some married women in Corinth were renouncing sex within marriage, and their husbands, in desperation, were resorting to prostitutes? Painstakingly, Paul corrects their wrong notion of sexuality by affirming the goodness and giftedness of sexual relations within the context of marriage. Sexual desires are to be fulfilled within the bond of legal marriage. Unnecessary abstinence in marriage can cause more temptations and tensions. Paul admonishes the spouses not to defraud each other by withholding conjugal rights. Temporary abstention for the purposes of prayer and fasting may be allowed but only by mutual consent. After the temporary abstention they ought to come together again so that Satan does not tempt them because of lack of self-control. Paul does not suggest prolonged sexual abstinence. In the passage, Paul is telling us that although marriage is the norm, but celibacy is even better. But it is a gift that is not for all. To be married or single is a special gift from God. At the time of writing, Paul was unmarried or even perhaps a widower.

The third chapter is a theological analysis of the pericope under scrutiny. As said earlier, Paul in this passage affirms the giftedness and benefits of marriage. Marriage is part of God's design for humankind, therefore it must be protected from Satan's destructive power. The highest manifestation of the marital union is sex. Sex provides an opportunity for a married couple to become intimate with one another. The goal is sex in marriage is spiritual union. In the words of St. John Chrysostom, "Their intercourse accomplishes the joining of their bodies, and they are made one, just as when perfume is mixed with ointment" (12th *Homily on Colossians*). Thus, in selfless love, "Let the husband render to his wife the affection due her, and likewise also the wife to her husband" (7:3). Paul compels spouses to satisfy and protect each other.

Although Paul knew that celibacy was good for him, he would not impose it on anyone. For Paul it is clear that each one has his/her own gift from God. Both states (marriage and singleness) in life live a complete dedication to God. Both states are ways to sanctification. Thus, married couples ought not to live as though they are celibates.

Paul has taught us in this passage the beauty of sex within marriage. For him, the human person is a bodily being. Paul is not anti-sex. But sex is not just delight; it involves great duty among married couples. A duty is a moral or legal responsibility or obligation arising from one's position. It is the duty of each married person to meet the sexual needs of his or her partner. All Christians ought to have healthy perspectives of marital sexuality. Included here is Paul's positive valuation of the body ($\sigma\hat{\omega}\mu\alpha$). The body is not evil, as the Gnostics thought. The body is the temple of the Holy Spirit.

The passage honor and elevates women. Paul is neither chauvinist nor misogynist. He takes a high view of women. In this passage, the egalitarian Paul moves away from the usual Roman norm in which the husband dominated the wife. In this passage, marriage is a mutuality of relationships. It is not only the husband who has a

right over the wife; the wife too has the right over the body of the husband. Unfortunately, there are still places in the world today where women are not entitled to enjoy sex. In these societies women have been taught from their childhood that sex is basically evil or that it is man's pleasure and a woman's duty. Women are to remain passive receivers. This is the reason why these societies still practice women circumcision. With Paul advocating equal conjugal rights, husbands must meet the sexual desires of their wives (not just theirs), which includes emotional, mental, and spiritual needs as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Basic References and Working Instruments

- Aland, Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger. Eds. *Nestle-Aland: Greek-English New Testament*. Editio XXVII. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider. Eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 Vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990-93. [=EDNT]
- Bible edition, *New Revised Standard Version*. 1989.
- Buttrick, George Arthur. *The Interpreter's Dictionary of The Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia*. Vol 3. Nashville, NY: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Kohlenberger, John R, Edward W. Goodrick, James A. Swanson. Eds. *The Greek English Concordance to the New Testament with the New International Version*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1997.
- Perschbacher, Wesley J. *The New Analytical Greek Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publisher, 1990.
- Rogers, Cleon L and Cleon L. Rogers III. *The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998.

B. Commentaries

- Baab, O.J. "Marriage." In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia*. Vol-3. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Nashville, NY: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Barclay, William. *The Letters to the Corinthians*. The New Daily Study Bible. Bangalore: Theological Publications, 2009.
- Donaldson, Terence L. "The Pauling Epistles." *The Oxford Bible Commentary*. Edited by John Muddiman and John Barton. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987; Reprinted. 1991.
- Godet, F. *Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Vol. 1. London: T. & T. Clark, 1889.
- Getty, Mary Ann. *1 Corinthians*. The Collegeville Bible Commentary: New Testament. Edited by Robert J. Karris. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Horsley, Richard A. *1 Corinthians*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1998.

- Lake, Kirsopp. *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul: Their Motive and Origin*. London: Rivingtons, 1911.
- Luck, Coleman G. *First Corinthians*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1958.
- Malina, Bruce J. and John J. Pilch. *Social-Science Commentary on the Letter of Paul*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Martin, Alfred. *First Corinthians*. Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1989.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The First Letter to the Corinthians," In *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Student Edition. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy. London/ New York: Geoffrey Chapman, 1993.
- Pascuzzi, Maria A. "The First Letter to the Corinthians." *New Collegeville Bible Commentary*. Edited by Daniel Durken. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008.
- Prior, David. *The Message of 1 Corinthians: The Bible Speaks Today*. Edited by John Stott. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 1993, reprinted, 2008.
- Snyder, Graydon F. *First Corinthians: A Faith Community Commentary*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1992.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. New York: Crossroad, 1992.
- University of Navarre. *The Navarre Bible: The letters of Saint Paul*. Texts and Commentaries. Dublin: Four Courts Press/ New York: Scepter Publisher, 2005.

C. Books and Articles

- Balz, Horst. "προσευχή." *EDNT* 3 (1993): 164-169.
- Bartsch, Hans-Werner. "ἴδιος." *EDNT* 2 (1991): 171-172.
- Bauer, Johannes B. "γυνή." *EDNT* 1 (1990): 266.
- Baumgarten, Jörg. "καίρός." *EDNT* 2 (1991): 232-235.
- Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University, 1988 / London: Faber and Faber, 1989.
- Brown, Raymond E. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. The Anchor Bible Reference. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1997.
- Bruce, F. F. *Apostle of the Heart Set Free*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, reprinted, 1991.
- . *1 and 2 Corinthians*. NCBC. London, 1971; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.

- Bühner, Jan-Adolf. “ἀποστρέω.” *EDNT I* (1990): 142.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Clement of Alexandria. “On Marriage: Miscellanies,” Book3, in *Alexandrian Christianity*. Edited by John Ernest Leonard Oulton and Henry Chadwick. Vol 2 of the Library of Christian Classics. Edited by John Baillie. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.
- Collins, Raymond F. *Christian Morality: Biblical Foundations*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986.
- Dickey, E. *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids, MN/ Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. 2nd edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Elliger, Winfried. “σύμφωνος.” *EDNT 3* (1993): 289-292.
- Fitzler, Gottfried. “πορνεία.” *EDNT 3* (1993): 137-139.
- Germain, Grisez. *The Way of The Lord Jesus: Living a Christian Life*. Vol-2. Quincy, IL: Franciscan Herald Press, 1993.
- Hafemann, S. J. “Letters to the Corinthians.” *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne & Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove, IL/Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Hübner, Hans. “γράφω.” *EDNT I* (1990):261.
- Hurd, J. C. *The Origin of I Corinthians*. London: SPCK, 1965.
- Hunter, David G. *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Jovinianist Controversy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- O’Keefe, John. “Marriage is Good, Celibacy is Better.” In *Marriage in the Catholic Tradition: Scripture, Tradition, and Experience*. Edited by Todd A. Salzman, Thomas M. Kelly, and John J. O’Keefe. New York, NY: Crossroad, 2004.
- Lawler, Ronald OFM, Joseph Boyle and William May. *Catholic Sexual Ethics. A Summary, Explanation and Defense*. Huntington, Ind.: Our Sunday Visitor, 1985.
- Loader, William. *The New Testament on Sexuality*. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Radl, Walter. “σχολάζω.” *EDNT 3* (1993): 318-321.
- Sand, Alexander. “ἄνθρωπος.” *EDNT I* (1990):100-104.
- _____. “ἀποδίδωμι.” *EDNT I* (1990): 128.

- Schmithals, Walter. *Gnosticism in Corinth: Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1971.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Paul the Missionary: Realities, Strategies, and Methods*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2008.
- Soards, Marion L. *The Apostle Paul: An Introduction to His Writings and Teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1987.
- Wanke, Joachim. “καλός.” *EDNT* 2 (1991): 244-245.
- Werner, Kummel Georg. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Revised & Enlarged Edition. Translated by Howard Clark Kee. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1990.
- West, Christopher. *Good News about Sex and Marriage*. Cincinnati, Ohio: St. Anthony Messenger Press, 2004.
- Winter, Bruce W. *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Wire, Antoinette Clark. *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul’s Rhetoric*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Witherington, Ben. *The Paul Quest: The Renewed Search for the Paul of Tarsus*. Downer Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1998.
- Witherup, Ronald D. *101 Questions & Answers on Paul*. Bangalore, Mumbai: Paulist Press, 2003.
- Wright, David F. “Sexuality, Sexual Ethics,” *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid. Illinois/Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Wolter, Michael. “ὀφειλή.” *EDNT* 2 (1991): 550.

D. Journals

- Faw, Chalmer E. “On the Writing of First Thessalonians,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71 (1952): 217-225.
- Fee, Gordon D. “1 Corinthians 7:1 in the NIV,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*. 23/4 (1980): 307-314.
- Gary J. Quinn. “A New Look at Christian Marriage,” *Journal of Religion and Health* 10 (1971): 388-395.
- Heith-Stade David. “Marriage in the Canons of the council in Trullo.” *Studia Theologica* 64, no. 1 (June 2010):4-21. *Academic Search Complete, EBSCOhost*.

- Laney, Carl J. "Paul and the Permanence of Marriage in 1 Corinthians 7." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* (1982):283-294.
- Kwasniewski, Peter. "St. Thomas on the Grandeur and Limitations of Marriage." *Nova et Vetera*, Vol 10/2 (2012): 415-436.
- Marrow, Stanley B. "Marriage and Divorce in the New Testament," *Anglican Theological Review* 70/1 (1988): 3-15.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. "Concerning περὶ δέ in 1 Corinthians," *Novum Testamentum* 31 (1989): 229-256.
- Molvaer, Reidulf K. "St. Paul's Views on Sex According to 1 Corinthians 7:9 & 36-38." *Studia Theologica* 58 (2004): 45-49.
- Phipps, William E. "Is Paul's Attitude towards Sexual Relations Contained in 1 Cor 7:1?" *New Testament Studies* 28 (1982):125-131.
- Rubio, Julie Hanlon. "Jesus, Paul, and Family Values," *Ex Auditu* 28 (2012): 45-69. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLA Serials, EBSCOhost*.
- Winter, Bruce W. "1 Corinthians 7:6-7: A Caveat and a Framework for 'The Sayings' in 7:8-24." *Tyndale Bulletin* 48.1(1997): 57-65. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLA Serials, EBSCOhost*.

E. Other Sources

- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. "Die Christuspartei in der Korinthischen Gemeinde," *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 4(1831):61-206.
- Catholic Truth Society. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2005.
- Code of Canon law. In *The Code of Canon Law: English Translation*. Pasay City, Philippines: Paulines Publishing House, 2001.
- King, David M. D. "The Marriage Debate and 1 Corinthians 7: The Use of Paul in Patristic and Reformation Controversies over Marriage and Celibacy." Master of Arts Thesis in Biblical Studies: Iliff School of Theology, 2011.
- Lührmann, D. *Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden* (WMANT, 16). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen Verlag, 1965.
- Monera, Arnold T. "Glossolalia and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians." A Survey of Related Literature. STL Thesis. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1994.
- . "Paul and 'The Powers That Be': An Exegesis of Romans 13, 1-7." Doctoral dissertation in Sacred Theology. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2002.
- Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, 2005.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/justpeace/document/rc_pc_justpeace_doc_20060526_compendio-dott-soc_en.html. Accessed on May 3, 2015.

- Pontifical Council for the Family. *Vademecum for Confessors*, 1997.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/family/documents/rc_pc_family_doc_12021997_vademecum_en.html. Accessed on May 5, 2015.
- Pope Francis. *Evangelii Gaudium*. Apostolic Exhortation to the Bishops, Clergy, Consecrated Persons and the Lay Faithful on the Proclamation of the Gospel in Today's World. New York, NY: Crown Publishing Group, 2014
- _____. *Lumen Fidei*, 2013. Encyclical Letter to the Bishops Priests and Deacons, Consecrated Person and the Lay Faithful on Faith.
http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20130629_enciclica-lumen-fidei.html. Accessed on May 4, 2015.
- Pope John Paul II, *Familiaris Consortio*, 1981. Apostolic Exhortation to the Episcopate to the Clergy and to the Faithful of the Whole Catholic Church on the Role of the Christian Family in the Modern World. Libreria Editrice Vaticana. http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_19811122_familiaris-consortio.html. Accessed on May 3, 2015.
- Tolbert, Marry Ann. "Ancient Resources for Contemporary Same-Sex unions." In *Authorizing Marriage? : Canon, Tradition, and Critique in the Blessing of Same-sex Unions*. Edited by David M. Mellott, Meghan T. Sweeney, and Mark D. Jordan. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2006: 44, *eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)*, EBSCOhost. Accessed April 28, 2015.