Sacrilege and Temple Imagery in 1 Corinthians

Ethan Johnson

University of
St Andrews

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

at the University of St Andrews

September 2021

Candidate's declaration

I, Ethan Johnson, do hereby certify that this thesis, submitted for the degree of PhD, which is approximately 75,000 words in length, has been written by me, and that it is the record of work carried out by me, or principally by myself in collaboration with others as acknowledged, and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for any degree. I confirm that any appendices included in my thesis contain only material permitted by the 'Assessment of Postgraduate Research Students' policy.

I was admitted as a research student at the University of St Andrews in September 2017.

I confirm that no funding was received for this work.

Date: 03/05/2022 Signature of candidate:

Supervisor's declaration

I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate for the degree of PhD in the University of St Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree. I confirm that any appendices included in the thesis contain only material permitted by the 'Assessment of Postgraduate Research Students' policy.

Date Signature of supervisor

Permission for publication

In submitting this thesis to the University of St Andrews we understand that we are giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. We also understand, unless exempt by an award of an embargo as requested below, that the title and the abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker, that this thesis will be electronically accessible for personal or research use and that the library has the right to migrate this thesis into new electronic forms as required to ensure continued access to the thesis.

I, Ethan Johnson, confirm that my thesis does not contain any third-party material that requires copyright clearance.

The following is an agreed request by candidate and supervisor regarding the publication of this thesis:

Printed copy

No embargo on print copy.

Electronic copy

No embargo on electronic copy.

Date: 03/05/2022 Signature of candidate:

Date Signature of supervisor

Underpinning Research Data or Digital Outputs

Candidate's declaration

I, Ethan Johnson, hereby certify that no requirements to deposit original research data or digital outputs apply to this thesis and that, where appropriate, secondary data used have been referenced in the full text of my thesis.

Date: 03/05/2022 Signature of candidate:

ABSTRACT

Most scholars read Paul's application of temple imagery to human beings within a Jewish context, which sometimes means dichotomising Jewish and Greco-Roman data. This leads to approaches that overlook signs of potential resonance between 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 and discussions of sacrilege in ancient literature. In this thesis, I will contend that Paul's use of temple imagery in these two passages demonstrates coherence with a pattern common to ancient literature, and that recognizing this coherence clarifies the way the temple should be understood to function in its rhetorical context. I argue that a system of "major metaphysical pollution" lies beneath ancient discussions of sacrilege and I outline the causes, effects, terminology, and means of resolution associated with this system of pollution. I note distinctions between this system and discussions of moral pollution in the OT and consider how one would determine whether Paul's temple imagery coheres with one system or the other. I also ask whether the logic of major metaphysical pollution is discernible in Josephus and Philo in order to determine whether this system is invoked by other first-century Jews and to understand how these Jews might use it. I then exegete both 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19. In both cases, I attend to the position of the temple in its rhetorical context and compare Paul's use of the temple with the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution. I show that the cause, effect, and resolution of threats against the temple in these passages from 1 Corinthians follow the logic of this pollution system. I then offer a new understanding of the temple in its context, based on these conclusions. I suggest that the appeal to the temple in these passages draws on major metaphysical pollution in order to warn the Corinthians to desist problematic behaviours by recasting them as sacrilegious.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION TO THIS STUDY

In Pausanias's description of Boeotia, he writes the following concerning the temple of the Cabeiri:

> Certain men of the army of Xerxes left behind with Mardonius in Boeotia entered the sanctuary of the Cabeiri, perhaps in the hope of great wealth, but rather, I suspect, to show their contempt of its gods; all these immediately were struck with madness, and flung themselves to their deaths into the sea or from the tops of precipices. Again, when Alexander after his victory wasted with fire all the Thebaïd, including Thebes itself, some men from Macedonia entered the sanctuary of the Cabeiri, as it was in enemy territory, and were destroyed by thunder and lightning from heaven. So sacred this sanctuary has been from the beginning. (Pausanias, *Descr.* 9.25.9–9.26.1 [Jones])

In this passage, acts of aggression towards a temple lead to swift acts of judgement and destruction from the gods. The explanation provided for this judgement is grounded in the temple's holiness, here indicated by the word ἅγιος. This hardly represents an isolated case. Ancient literature from the Greco-Roman world is replete with similar stories in which a sacrilegious act, that is, an act against the gods that threatens or pollutes a holy temple, leads to serious judgement.

This pattern of thinking has been highlighted repeatedly in secondary literature dealing with ancient religion and systems of purity and pollution.[1] But does this same pattern of thinking appear also in the texts of the New Testament, itself a library of literature from the Greco-Roman world? A brief glance at 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 reveals several elements that suggest possible resonance between these Pauline texts and other ancient texts discussing sacrilege and judgement. 1 Cor 3:16–17 reads: "Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's

[1] E.g., Parker, 1983; Burkert, 1985; Petrovic and Petrovic, 2016.

Spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God's temple, God will destroy that person. For God's temple is holy, and you are that temple."[2] 1 Cor 6:18–19 reads: "Shun fornication! Every sin that a person commits is outside the body; but the fornicator sins against the body itself. Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God." In both passages, a holy temple is under threat, either from "destruction" in 1 Cor 3:16–17 or from πορνεία, a sin against the body-temple, in 1 Cor 6:18–19. What is more, judgement looms clearly on the horizon in 1 Cor 3:16–17. These features of the Pauline texts, namely, a threatened, holy temple and the possibility of judgement, invite comparison with the many stories of sacrilege and judgement found in the ancient world.

Despite these potential similarities, placing Paul's temple imagery in conversation with the discussions of sacrilege in ancient literature cuts against the grain of much Pauline scholarship. Pauline scholars rightly want to read Paul in the context of Judaism, but this often leads to conceptions of a Paul whose theology of the temple is based on his reading of the OT and whose views of temples are therefore incompatible with views considered to be "pagan." For example, in his classic commentary on 1 Corinthians, Gordon Fee says, "The imagery of the church as God's temple . . . reflects the OT people of God."[3] Richard Hays claims, "when Paul speaks of God's Spirit dwelling in a temple, he surely does not mean just any random gods and temples of the pagan world. He can be thinking of only one thing: the Spirit of the God of Israel in the Temple at Jerusalem."[4] More recently, Nijay Gupta believes the Jerusalem temple, in contrast to any other temple, provides the source domain for Paul's temple metaphor because of

[2] Biblical quotations are from the NRSV unless otherwise noted.

[3] Fee 1987, 146–47.

[4] Hays 1997, 57.

OT allusions in 1:18—3:23 and in 3:16–17.[5] It is appropriate to see Paul as a Jew and to take seriously the impact of the OT on his beliefs. For these scholars and others, however, the theoretical commitment to reading Paul as a Jew leads them not to look beyond Jewish texts (and this frequently means the OT) in their efforts to understand how Paul uses temple imagery.

But how should we conceive of the relationship between what we call "Jewish" and what we call "Greco-Roman" in the first century and is Greco-Roman material such as the story from Pausanias cited above out of bounds for the study of Paul's temple imagery? Is there a distinction between first-century Jewish views of sacrilege and other Greco-Roman views of sacrilege, and if so, then of what sort? There certainly are instances where Paul contrasts his own views with things he identifies as Gentile or pagan. In 1 Cor 12, for example, Paul says, "You know that when you were pagans [ἔθνος], you were enticed and led astray to idols that could not speak."[6] Passages like this indicate that, for Paul, there were significant differences between certain practices common among Gentile pagans, particularly idolatry,[7] and the kind of life to which those Gentiles had now been called in Christ.[8] At the same time, although there are places where

[5] Gupta 2010, 66. For support of this point he cites Williams 2001, 257–68. It should be noted, however, that Williams concedes, "a citation or allusion is not present within this passage [3:16–17]" (pg. 257).

[6] Cf. 1 Cor 6:9–10, in which Paul lists the kinds of people who will not inherit the kingdom. Included among these are the εἰδωλολάτραι. At the conclusion of this list Paul claims, "And this is what some of you used to be!" (καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε).

[7] There is also an assumed difference for Paul between pagan views of sexuality and Jewish views. For example, in 1 Cor 5:1 Paul claims, "there is sexual immorality among you, and of a kind that is not found even among pagans." The way he introduces this topic suggests that there are many things pagans would not consider to be sexually improper, but which Jews (and presumably early Jesus followers) would consider improper.

[8] So Concannon 2014, 115, who notes, "the Corinthians, who used to be Gentiles, have become something different. Their differentness is now marked by a changed cultic practice: as non-Gentiles, the Corinthians are no longer compelled to serve mute idols," and then asks, "But what then have these non-Gentiles become exactly?" He concludes, "the identity of the Corinthians remains fluid and 'in-between' in Paul's rhetoric."

The idea of Gentiles not being Gentiles any longer raises several questions about the Corinthians' identity, but they go beyond the scope of this thesis. For my purposes, what is critical is that there were some instances where Paul explicitly contrasts something Jewish with something Gentile or pagan. For further discussion of the meaning of Paul's apostleship to the Gentiles; the relationship between Jews, Gentiles, and the law; the identity of Gentile

it is appropriate to see disjunction between Paul the Jew and the many Greco-Roman pagans of the first century, there are similarities as well. Paul spoke Greek, traveled the Mediterranean, and was subject to Roman laws. Rightly acknowledging Paul's Jewishness does not establish for us each place where Paul's thinking is distinct from other, non-Jewish people.

What is more, even if we accept that the OT is vital for Paul, does that mean Paul's views of temples align precisely with the ways that modern scholarship has delineated the temple theology of OT texts? Paul is a *reader* of the OT text corpus, along with other Jews in his day, and if we grant that the OT is athoritative for him, we still may need to consider how he and other Jews in the first century read that text. We may ask, further, whether first-century Jewish discussions of temple(s) rigidly adhere to, for example, the system of moral and ritual pollution laid out in the OT,[9] or whether these discussions reveal points of coherence with other pollution frameworks found frequently among the Hellenised peoples of the broader Greco-Roman world.

In this thesis, I will take these questions seriously and ask whether Paul's use of temple imagery in 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6 draws on concepts of sacrilege that are common in the ancient world, and then consider, if he does, whether that refines our understanding of the temple's role in its rhetorical context. Answering these questions requires first delineating the logic by which discussions of sacrilege operate, and then considering whether and how Jews in the first century follow this logic of sacrilege in their own narratives of temple desecration. In addition to providing a context within which we can consider Paul's temple imagery, we must then also look at Paul's actual text in 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 and ask whether coherence between these concepts of sacrilege and Paul's application of temple imagery can be established.

Christ-followers; and many other related questions, see, e.g., Stowers 1994; Gager 2000; Hodge 2005; 2007; 2015; Eisenbaum 2009; Nanos and Zetterholm 2015; Fredriksen 2017; Nanos 2017.

[9] I use here the language of Jonathan Klawans (see Klawans 2000 and 2006).

This research does not take place in a vacuum. My study is possible only because of the voluminous research already written on the topic of Paul and his cultic language. In the next section, I will provide an introduction to some of the most important articles and monographs that have touched on Paul's temple imagery, noting both where I am indebted to them and where I aim to build on them. Following this review, I will explain my selection of texts for analysis and my terminological choices, then provide an outline of later chapters.

1.1 – History of Interpretation

In this history of interpretation I will proceed through each work in chronological order, noting how certain conversations, particularly concerning the spiritualisation of the cult, the origin of Paul's temple imagery, and the supposed distinction between Jewish and Greco-Roman concepts of temples have developed over time and have shaped current conversations. I will also ask about the extent to which each study engages concepts of sacrilege. I am most interested in studies that deal specifically with the temple in 1 Corinthians, but I also include important work on the temple in the Bible more broadly, provided that such work also touches Paul's use of the temple.

1.1.1 – Survey of Literature

1932 – Hans Wenschkewitz: *Die Spiritualisierung Der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priest Und Opfer Im Neuen Testament*

Hans Wenschkewitz reads Paul's temple imagery as a spiritualisation of the temple cult. Like many scholars from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, he views religion through a lens of evolutionary development in which primitive religions ("ursprünglich niederen Religionsformen") concerned only with cultic purity ("Kultische Reinheit") are understood to

develop over time into more inwardly and ethically focused religions.[10] He distinguishes between the kinds of spiritualisation that are found in the OT and pseudepigrapha on the one hand, and the kinds found in Stoic literature and Philo on the other. In his view, Paul brings together these two notions when he defines the community as a temple. His work on Paul's temple imagery remains essential and his influence can be seen in several of the studies I cite below.[11]

Wenschkewitz does not engage concepts of sacrilege, but while he draws a line of demarcation between OT spiritualisation and Stoic/Philonic spiritualisation he does not suppose a flat Jewish/Greco-Roman distinction. For example, he posits a link between Philo and non-Jewish Stoic thinkers. He also suggests that Paul interacts both with the OT scriptures and a Hellenistic Jewish context while simultaneously noting the unique characteristics of Paul's application of temple imagery to a community.[12] Naturally, he is unaware of community-as-temple imagery in the Dead Sea Scrolls because he writes in 1932, prior to their discovery. Two questions Wenschkewitz raises set the stage for much of the later work on Paul's temple imagery. The first of these is the question of spiritualisation. Later scholars often engage this question and ask what Paul's application of temple imagery to persons says about his view of the

[10] Given the time in which Wenschkewitz lived and wrote, his approach is not surprising. Rajak 2001 highlights the ways in which many writers in the nineteenth century pushed against the supposed exclusivity of Judaism, and indeed, one of Wenschkewitz's points is that the spiritualisation of the temple in the NT means a universalisation of Jewish religion. His work is therefore quite in line with the assumptions and prejudices of much other scholarship in the early twentieth century.

[11] Citations of Wenschkewitz are found in early works on Paul's temple imagery such as McKelvey 1969, 104, n. 3, and Newton 1985, 8, as well as in more recent works such as Weissenrieder 2012, 378; Richardson 2018, 7–9; and Regev 2019, 53. Despite the variety of positions taken by these scholars, all at least mention Wenschkewitz's influence on the discussion.

[12] For example, see, e.g., Wenschkewitz 1932, 112, where he compares Paul with the Stoics and points out that the application of temple imagery to a community rather than an individual is not found in the Stoics, "denn hier war alles auf den Einzelnen, auf das Individuum eingestellt." Wenschkewitz was, of course, not the first to note a possible connection between Paul's temple imagery and Stoicism. See, e.g., Weiss 1925, 166. The influence of such views is also seen later in, e.g., Barrett 1971, 90 and 151

concrete Jerusalem temple cult. The second is the question of origin. This concern to determine and understand the source of Paul's temple imagery was central in the first four decades following Wenschkewitz and it continues to be discussed even in recent scholarship.

1965 – Bertil Gärtner: *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*

Bertil Gärtner's study examines New Testament concepts of the church and the temple in light of similar passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls. By bringing the Scrolls into conversation with the NT, he seeks to illuminate the background to NT concepts, especially those "which have hitherto been regarded as part of the Hellenistic heritage."[13] He therefore picks up the question of origin raised by Wenschkewitz and emphasises "Palestinian background" over Hellenistic background.[14] He argues that Qumran and the early Christian communities observe the "same principle in respect of the temple and its cultus" and that details shared between the NT and Qumran texts point to some kind of connection between the two groups.[15] He then suggests the early Christians in general might have been influenced by Qumran[16] and he also hints that temple symbolism as Paul employs it originates in Qumran.[17] He even says it is possible that "Jesus was aware of the central Qumran tenet, that the community had come to replace the desecrated

[13] Gärtner 1965, x.

[14] Gärtner 1965, x.

[15] Gärtner 1965, xi.

[16] Gärtner 1965, 139. He posits (although without any claim to certainty) that "the traditions in question were brought into the Church by former members of the Qumran sect or other Essene groups." Recent scholarship challenges such a supposed influence of Qumran on the NT. See, e.g., Bauckham 2003 and Regev 2007.

[17] Gärtner 1965, 56, and see also the footnote on that page.

Jerusalem temple."[18] His interpretation of temple imagery in Paul focuses on similarities between Paul and Qumran such as holiness/purity or God's presence in the community.[19]

Gärtner's study does not engage concepts of sacrilege and drives a wedge between Hellenistic and Palestinian Jewish background. He aims to show that we can find sources for NT temple imagery in a Palestinian Jewish background, without recourse to Hellenistic/Stoic texts. In one sense, this is a fruitful project because it demonstrates how Paul's use of temple imagery is consistent with the practice of some other Jewish communities. At the same time, the contrast he sets up between Jewish and Hellenistic contexts is problematic. For one thing, it can obscure, even if unintentionally, the fact that the Qumran community itself represents a kind of Hellenised Judaism. For another, it establishes a tendency to divide Jewish material from all other Greco-Roman material and treat the two categories as incompatible with one another.

1969 – R.J. McKelvey: *The New Temple*

R.J. McKelvey is another scholar interested in the spiritualisation of the temple and the relationship between temple imagery in the NT and the cult in Jerusalem. He considers the image of the church as God's temple and traces the development of that idea from early Israelite religion to the second temple period and the NT. His survey interacts closely not only with the OT, but also with the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the Rabbis, the Scrolls, Plato, and Philo. His treatment of Paul is detailed and nuanced. He rightly notes differences in the applications of temple imagery in various Pauline texts and avoids merging Pauline concepts with those found in

[18] Gärtner 1965, 139.

[19] The full discussion is found in Gärtner 1965, 49–71. It is surprising that although Gärtner treats Eph 2:18–22 and 1 Tim 3:15 in some detail, he does not provide any detailed analysis of 1 Cor 6:19 and only mentions it once in passing on page 141.

other books such as, for example, 1 Peter.[20] His goal, however, is to draw conclusions about temple imagery in the NT as a whole. He concludes that the NT takes up the temple theme in order to show "that God has fulfilled his word of promise made by the prophets and erected a new and more glorious temple."[21] This represents, for Mckelvey, "the spiritualization of the temple and cult" and a new temple that "supersedes and not merely consummates the previous modes of divine indwelling."[22]

McKelvey offers a well-rounded approach to temple imagery that considers a variety of sources. He avoids overly simple dichotomies and is aware of Hellenism's influence on Jewish texts.[23] He does not, however, give any sustained attention to concepts of temple sacrilege. Moreover, his goal is essentially dissimilar from mine in this thesis. Where he is interested in the appropriation of temple imagery in the NT in general, I am interested in the ways in which Paul, specifically, may draw on concepts of sacrilege in his appeal to the image of the temple in 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6.

1971 – Georg Klinzing: *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament*

Georg Klinzing's study focuses on cultic imagery in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but it does also include a survey of NT parallels. The majority (fully two-thirds) of the work deals with issues

[20] McKelvey 1969, 106, explicitly marks the difference between the temple as the place of God's presence in Paul and the temple as the place of sacrifice in 1 Peter. To clarify, I do not believe it is an error *per se* to consider Pauline temple imagery and Petrine temple imagery together, but it is all too easy to assume that Paul and other NT texts are using the temple in the same manner and towards the same purpose without adequately considering the specifics of each text.

[21] McKelvey 1969, 180.

[22] McKelvey 1969, 180.

[23] McKelvey 1969, 44.

related to the Qumran community and its texts. This includes an analysis of the relationship between the Qumran community and the Jerusalem temple cult followed by a thorough analysis of those texts in which Klinzing sees descriptions of the community as a temple.[24] More important for my thesis is Klinzing's understanding of NT temple imagery as it relates to Qumran. Following in the path set by Wenschkewitz, he addresses issues related to the origin of NT temple imagery. In his view, and with Gärtner, NT temple imagery depends on the Scrolls. He says that where the church speaks of itself as the new temple, "kann kein Zweifel darüber bestehen, daß diese Vorstellung aus der Qumrangemeinde stammt."[25] He applies this view no less to Paul. He notes, for example, that in 1 Cor 3 both the identification of the community as a temple as well as the connection between the temple and the images of a field and a building suggest a close connection between Paul and Qumran. Klinzing also claims that 2 Cor 6:14 originates in Qumran, although he believes it was reworked in Christian contexts.[26]

Klinzing's work, like Gärtner's, is not primarily concentrated on concepts of temple sacrilege. He tends also to create a sharp distinction between material he labels "Greco-Roman" and material he calls "Jewish." To the extent that Klinzing does interact with this Greco-Roman material, he does so in order to distance Paul from it. On 1 Cor 6:19 he writes: "Es ist sogar wahrscheinlich, daß Paulus im bewußten Gegensatz zu der hellenistischen Vorstellung und ihrer Nichtachtung des Leibes gerade diesen als Tempel bezeichnet."[27] This tendency to mention

[24] Some of the other scholars surveyed here question whether these Qumran texts do in fact present the Qumran community as a replacement temple, e.g., Lanci 1997, 13–19. This question is not vital for my thesis, however, since I am not examining parallels between Qumran and Pauline temple imagery in any great detail.

[25] Klinzing 1971, 210.

[26] Klinzing 1971, 211.

[27] Klinzing 1971, 184.

Greco-Roman data from non-Jewish contexts only to dismiss its relevance is common to many of the studies that interact with Paul's temple imagery.[28]

1976 – Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza: *Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT*

Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza brings a strong methodological critique to the earlier discussions of the origin of cultic imagery in the NT. She argues that comparisons between cultic language in Qumran and cultic language in the NT should take into account the differences in theological situations, motivations, and interests that led the two communities to apply cultic language to themselves. She suggests that Qumran developed patterns of transference[29] in a context in which the community was separated from the temple because it was polluted. However, in her view, the Qumran community did not question the theological validity of the temple as such. Rather, they "held Israel's cultic purity and holiness in high esteem."[30] This led them to reimagine the community itself as the place where atonement was accomplished and where one could worship God in purity and holiness. On the other hand, she argues that cultic imagery in the NT grew from a conviction that salvation in Jesus Christ meant the end of the Jerusalem temple and its cult.[31] Paul's use of temple imagery, she maintains, is not oriented around atonement, but around the indwelling of the Spirit, and Paul employs such imagery not in a context of sectarian

[28] A point raised by Richardson 2018, 10–11. See, e.g., Hogeterp 2006, 320.

[29] Schüssler Fiorenza 1976, 161. She argues, "Since the category 'spiritualization' has so many different shades of meaning and entails certain dogmatic presuppositions, its use tends not to clarify but to confuse. Therefore, instead of using the category of 'spiritualization' I shall employ the more descriptive term 'transference.' This term indicates that Jewish and Hellenistic cultic concepts were shifted to designate a reality which was not cultic."

[30] Schüssler Fiorenza 1976, 165.

[31] Schüssler Fiorenza 1976, 168.

separation, but in a context of missionary activity and as a way to characterise Christians over against the pagan world.[32]

Although Schüssler Fiorenza's work does not engage concepts of sacrilege, her insights remain critical for my thesis for two reasons. First, Schüssler Fiorenza notes that finding parallels between the NT and Jewish texts (i.e., the Scrolls) does not also mean that NT concepts belong solely in a Jewish rather than a Greco-Roman context.[33] There is, therefore, a need for greater care in the study of influences, parallels, and backgrounds. Second, she alerts us to the need for attention to the unique contexts of various texts that use cultic imagery. Both points are informative for this project. On the one hand, I will consider whether Paul's identity as a Jew means that his concepts of temple and sacrilege are uniquely Jewish in a way that is incompatible with other ancient frameworks. So, I will take seriously her point that parallels between Jewish texts do not necessarily indicate concepts that are exclusively Jewish. On the other hand, I will not only ask whether Paul *can* draw on ancient concepts of sacrilege, but also whether the specific contexts of 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6 make sense when read with these concepts in mind. This will require attention to the unique contexts of Paul's temple imagery.

1994 – Wolfram Strack: *Kultische Terminologie in Ekklesiologischen Kontexten in den Briefen des Paulus*

Wolfram Strack's monograph does not focus exclusively on Paul's use of temple imagery, but more generally on the way Paul uses cultic terminology in ecclesiastical contexts. He aims to fill a lacuna created by the fact that there is no detailed consideration of Pauline ecclesiology with

[32] Schüssler Fiorenza 1976, 171.

[33] This is especially true since Qumran itself represents a kind of Hellenised Judaism. See Schüssler Fiorenza 1976, 161, citing Hengel 1969.

regard to its connection to cultic terminology. He seeks not only to provide such a study, but also to engage the recurring question of spiritualisation that is raised so often in discussions of Paul's temple and/or cultic imagery.[34] Against much earlier scholarship, Strack contends that spiritualisation is not a sufficient or suitable term to describe Paul's use of cultic terminology, even if there is sometimes a spiritualising element in his writing.[35] Instead, Paul's cultic language all has the same goal: to express God's presence and closeness. Thus, Strack concludes, Paul's temple imagery does not spiritualise the temple. Instead, "Die Gemeinde ist so wirklich 'Tempel Gottes' (1 Kor 3,16f); denn wie der Tempel Ort der Gegenwart Gottes ist, so wohnt sein Geist in der vom Evangelium des Apostels konstituierten Gemeinde."[36]

In this work Strack does not engage discussions of sacrilege and he treats Jewish material as quite distinct from Greco-Roman material. In his introduction, he makes it clear that his monograph deals primarily with Paul in comparison to other Jewish texts such as the OT, texts from Qumran, and those written by Josephus and Philo,[37] but he does not deal sufficientlywith fact that the Scrolls, Josephus, and Philo are examples of Hellenistic Judaism. This carries through in his exegesis. For example, in his treatment of 1 Cor 3:16–17 he appeals to the prohibition tablet in the forecourt of the Herodian temple. He says, "Wie im Beispiel der Verbotstafeln vom Vor hof des Herodianischen Tempels wird auch in 1 Kor 3,17 das Sakrale als ein zu schützender Tabubereich beschrieben, so daß diese Warnung als eine sakralrechtliche

[34] Strack 1994, 8–9, citing Wenschkewitz 1932. Strack argues that the language of spiritualisation can be used "zum Teil unreflektiert" in biblical scholarship.

[35] Strack 1994, 396.

[36] Strack 1994, 396.

[37] Strack 1994, 8.

Norm bezeichnet werden kann."[38] He does not, however, compare this tablet with any other warnings concerning temples in the ancient world, nor does he examine the relationship between sacrilege, pollution, and judgement in order to clarify the logic by which discussions of temple violation operate.

1997 – John Lanci: *A New Temple for Corinth*

John Lanci offers one of the most focused studies of temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16–17 currently available. Like Strack, he critiques other approaches that see 1 Cor 3 as a spiritualisation of the temple as well as studies that compare 1 Corinthians with texts from Qumran.[39] Instead, he reads the temple in 1 Cor 3:16–17 with close attention to its context, both historical and rhetorical. Historically, he considers the social landscape of Roman Corinth, and notes the ways in which temples were "centering images," that is, symbols of social cohesion, not only for ancient Jews but also for ancient Greeks and Romans. Rhetorically, and in contrast to studies concerned with the origin of temple imagery, he seeks to understand the temple in light of the arguments and goals of 1 Corinthians, which he reads as a sustained, deliberative argument against dissension.[40] He concludes that the temple in 1 Cor 3:16–17 furthers Paul's goal to combat dissension because "of the community-defining role of some temples in Greco-Roman society."[41]

Lanci's work represents a valuable step in research on Paul's temple imagery because he turns his attention from spiritualisation and origin to rhetoric, placing importance not only on

[38] Strack 1994, 232.

[39] For his critique of those who spiritualise or interiorise the temple (especially Wenschkewitz and McKelvey), see Lanci 1997, 9. For his critique of those who see a connection between Paul and Qumran, see Lanci 1997, 13–19.

[40] Lanci 1997, 51–52.

[41] Lanci 1997, 89.

Paul's temple theology, but also on his use of the temple in its specific location in 1 Cor 3. He also takes seriously the need to consider material from the Greco-Roman world broadly speaking without assuming that anything Jewish is incompatible with anything Greco-Roman. There are, however, two areas where his work can be taken further. First he minimises aspects of the temple that relate to holiness, purity/pollution, and the Spirit in favour of an emphasis on the temple as an image of building. So, he does not ask how threats against a holy, indwelt temple might actually be quite distinct, both in nature and in consequence, from threats against a building under construction.[42] Second, he does not provide any detailed analysis of 1 Cor 6:19, presumably because this passage lacks the building language present in 1 Cor 3. In this thesis, I will build on Lanci's work and address these two points.

2004 – Gregory Beale: *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*

Gregory Beale's monograph revives questions of spiritualisation raised nearly a century earlier. Beale argues that "the Old Testament tabernacle and temples were symbolically designed to point to the cosmic eschatological reality that God's tabernacling presence, formerly limited to the holy of holies, was to be extended throughout the whole earth."[43] The vision in Revelation 21 is consequently seen as the final end-time temple "that will fill the entire cosmos."[44] Beale builds his argument on a wide-ranging study not only of biblical texts but also of ANE concepts of cosmic temples and priest kings who rule in the image of the gods. He argues that Paul further develops ideas about the inauguration of believers as the latter-day temple. He makes a strong

[42] Lanci 1997, 67–68.

[43] Beale 2004, 25.

[44] Beale 2004, 25.

case that the grouping of field, building, and temple in 1 Cor 3:5–17 is not "such a radical change of pictures as is sometimes thought."[45] He argues that Malachi 3–4 is the key background to 1 Cor 3:16–17.[46] Surprisingly, he offers no extended exegesis of 1 Cor 6:19, even though he does analyse 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians.

Beale's study does not interact significantly with concepts of sacrilege. In one sense, this is quite understandable because his goal is not to discuss sacrilege, but rather to trace a particular theme from the OT to the NT. Even so, it is surprising that Beale does not study the nature of threats against a holy temple or consider what the consequences of such threats might include because he does emphasise the holiness and purity of the temple in 1 Corinthians and notes that these attributes must be maintained.[47] The lack of attention to material from the Hellenistic and Roman periods is also striking, especially considering his interaction with ANE material. Beale's approach to Paul also differs markedly from mine in this thesis. He reads Paul's temple imagery in conversation with the OT, which is different from approaching Paul as a *reader* of the OT whose understanding of the temple may reflect a complex blend of OT and later Jewish/Hellenistic concepts.

2006 – Albert Hogeterp: *Paul and God's Temple*

More than many of the other scholars I review in this survey, Albert Hogeterp focuses on historical issues as he interprets Pauline cultic imagery. His key question is: "What does Paul's

[45] Beale 2004, 250.

[46] Beale 2004, 250–52.

[47] Beale 2004, 252. Beale's analysis of the temple and holiness in 1 Corinthians simply conflates purity with morality and defilement with immorality: "They [the Corinthians] are part of the latter-day temple, and just as the Old Testament temple was to be kept clean from defilement, how much more so are they to keep their bodies clean and separate from immorality." While there certainly is a connection between holiness and ethics, we should also consider how an offence against things that are sacred (like temples) might differ from an offence that might rightly be called "immoral," but which does not violate the sacred.

cultic imagery signify in view of Paul's gospel mission to the Diaspora?"[48] He pushes especially against the spiritualisation and substitution theses of many earlier scholars. He notes that Jews (like Philo) could use cultic imagery in figurative ways without losing their commitments to the concrete cult,[49] he cautions against reading the perspectives of NT writers who lived after 70 CE into Paul,[50] and he highlights the fact that Paul's writings do not explicitly contrast "the atonement for sin through Christ with contemporary Jewish cultic practices."[51] His analysis of 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6 places Paul squarely in the context of Jewish temple theology.[52] For example, in his reading of 1 Cor 3:16–17, he argues that, "Paul's theological notion of the indwelling presence of God's Spirit would not be foreign to those initiated in monotheistic worship in Paul's time," and he builds this case on an appeal to texts from the LXX, Josephus, and Qumran.[53] Similarly, in his discussion of 1 Cor 6:19, he claims that "Palestinian Jewish evidence provides a specific connection with Paul's idea of the body as Temple in the context of the exhortation against πορνεία,"[54] thereby tying the temple in 6:19 to a Jewish context. He concludes that Paul's temple imagery does not represent rejection or supersession of the Jerusalem cult, but serves a "paideutic" purpose by teaching the Corinthians a holy way of life.[55]

[48] Hogeterp 2006, 22.

[49] Hogeterp 2006, 6.

[50] Hogeterp 2006, 8.

[51] Hogeterp 2006, 10.

[52] Hogeterp 2006, 324, 343, etc.

[53] Hogeterp 2006, 327–30.

[54] Hogeterp 2006, 345. He bases this claim on an appeal to texts from Qumran.

[55] Hogeterp 2006, 384.

Hogeterp does not read Paul's temple imagery in light of concepts of sacrilege. Indeed, he frequently dismisses the relevance of Greco-Roman writings (by which he does not seem to mean those of Josephus and Philo since he relies on them extensively) and drives a wedge between Paul and concepts he considers to be pagan in origin. He says Paul could not have taken his temple imagery from a Greco-Roman context because, to list only a few examples, pagan temples had cult statues, which Paul disapproves of in 1 Cor 12:2;[56] pagans did not link cultic sanctity with a holy lifestyle outside of the cultic domain;[57] and Paul has a negative view of pagan temples.[58] Hogeterp is therefore mostly dismissive of the relevance of material not written by Jews.

2008 – Martin Vahrenhorst: *Kultische Sprache in den Paulusbriefen*

Martin Vahrenhorst's work adopts a decidedly different approach from Hogeterp and several others surveyed above because he considers the comprehensibility of Paul's cultic language to a Greco-Roman audience and argues that Paul's cultic language could make sense both to Jews and to Gentiles. At the conclusion of his analysis of 2 Corinthians, he says: "Mit kultisch geprägter Sprache illustriert Paulus—in für Juden und Nichtjuden verständlicher Weise—sein Amt, das Wesen der Gemeinde und die sich daraus ergebenden ethischen Konsequenzen."[59] He builds his case by surveying cultic language in Jewish contexts and then surveying cultic language in Greco-Roman contexts, particularly in the *Leges Sacrae*. He then works through Pauline texts in chronological order, making numerous comparisons along the way. He addresses

[56] Hogeterp 2006, 342.

[57] Hogeterp 2006, 317.

[58] Hogeterp 2006, 320.

[59] Vahrenhorst 2008, 227.

the question of origin so often raised by Pauline scholars and is not convinced that Paul's temple imagery depends specifically and exclusively on the Jerusalem temple, suggesting instead that to understand Paul's cultic language requires attention to "der jüdische und der nichtjüdische" contexts.[60]

With Vahrenhorst, I urge that we need not discount the relevance of Greco-Roman material from the outset. Although Jewish and pagan views of temples could differ in some significant ways,[61] both groups had temples and it is worth considering the extent to which concepts were shared between the two, if they were shared at all. While Vahrenhorst does still look at Jewish and Greco-Roman contexts separately, he encourages us to reconsider the way these are dichotomised. He does not provide a close comparison between 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6 and the logic of sacrilege, however. I will probe this particular connection to a greater degree than Vahrenhorst.

2010 – Timothy Wardle: *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*

Timothy Wardle's work builds on the frequent concern to identify the origin of the idea of Christians as a temple community. He nuances this discussion by distinguishing between the *effects* of temple imagery in Christianity on the one hand, and the *cause* of such imagery's development on the other.[62] He suggests that the appearance of temple imagery in the NT "was

[60] Vahrenhorst 2008, 15.

[61] Most obviously, one might say that Jewish monotheism insisted on the worship of one God only, in one temple only. Of course, while this is certainly true of some Jews (and is the perspective of the OT), the topic of Jewish monotheism is more complex than it might initially seem, and the nature of Jewish approaches to and beliefs in other gods (and pagan approaches to and belief in the Jewish god) should not be approached reductively. See the discussions of Jewish and pagan monotheism in Athanassiadi and Frede 1999; North 2005; Mitchell and van Nuffelen 2010; and Novenson 2020.

[62] Wardle 2010, 3. This is a worthy distinction since to ask about cause is to ask a decidedly different sort of question than to ask about effect. In this thesis I am interested in neither, but rather in the ways in which temple imagery is used in Paul's arguments.

not predicated primarily on the belief that God's presence could now be ultimately found in the Christian community," nor on the ideas that the "Christian community was now holy or that Gentiles could now be included."[63] Instead, Wardle proposes that such imagery grew from a common Jewish critique of the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood.[64] He argues his point not only with reference to early Christian literature, but also with reference to Jewish literature that critiques the high priesthood and to the alternative temples (physical or metaphysical) of Gerizim, Leontopolis, and Qumran. He notes that all three of the latter communities shared reservations about worshipping in the "polluted" Jerusalem temple.[65] Surprisingly, his analysis of Pauline temple imagery seems to conclude precisely the opposite of his overall point. He says that temple language in 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 6:19 is not "based on any denigration of the Jerusalem temple or its priests" but rather on Paul's belief "that the Holy Spirit now resides in the midst of the community."[66]

Wardle focuses on debates surrounding the Jerusalem temple as the primary context within which to understand NT temple imagery. It is therefore no surprise that he rarely mentions other (non-Jewish) material from the Greco-Roman world and does not engage concepts of sacrilege found in ancient literature. When he does mention material that he views as Hellenistic, he accentuates an essential disjunction between Paul and this material. For example, with many other scholars, Wardle notes differences between 1 Cor 6:19 and Hellenistic/Jewish-Hellenistic literature and says that Paul, uniquely, describes the body as a temple instead of the soul.[67] He

[63] Wardle 2010, 3.

[64] Wardle 2010, 3.

[65] See especially the concluding remarks in Wardle 2010, 162–65.

[66] Wardle 2010, 211.

[67] Wardle 2010, 219. He compares Paul with Seneca, *Ep.* 41.2 ("A holy spirit indwells within us, one who marks our good and bad deeds, and is our guardian. As we treat this spirit, so are we treated by it" [Gummere]) and

therefore mentions non-Jewish, Greco-Roman material only in order to mark Paul's dissimilarity from it.

2010 – Nijay Gupta: *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul*

Nijay Gupta examines Paul's "non-atonement cultic metaphors"[68] and aims to determine their importance for theology. His study tries not only to study the metaphors themselves, in isolation, but also to pay attention to their place in their rhetorical and social contexts. He relies particularly on the conceptual metaphor theory associated with George Lakoff, Mark Turner, and Mark Johnson.[69] He then adopts a "cognitive and socio-literary approach" because, he argues, metaphors must be understood as one part of a particular piece of communication.[70] Gupta helpfully attempts to narrow what he means by "metaphor" in order to clarify his selection and evaluation of particular instances of metaphorical language in Paul.[71] He sees the Jerusalem temple as the source domain for Paul's temple imagery[72] and thinks that such imagery communicates holiness, purity, and spiritual endowment and raises the possibility of judgement for harming the community.[73]

Philo, *Virtues* 35.188 ("When in His mercy and loving kindness God willed to establish the good among us also, He found no worthier temple on earth than the reasoning faculty, for in this alone as the more excellent part the good is enshrined, even though some may disbelieve, who have never tasted or only just sipped wisdom" [Colson]).

[68] Gupta 2010, 1.

[69] See Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff and Turner 1989.

[70] Gupta 2010, 2.

[71] See Gupta 2010, 32–33, although he is pessimistic about any scholar's ability to provide a universal definition.

[72] Gupta 2010, 66.

[73] See the clear diagrams in Gupta 2010, 67 and 73.

Gupta is highly resistant to the suggestion that Paul's temple imagery draws on concepts of temples found broadly in the ancient world outside of Jewish contexts. This is not only seen in his commitment to the Jerusalem temple as the source domain for Paul's temple imagery, but also in his critique of Vahrenhorst's monograph (examined above). Responding to Vahrenhorst's conclusion that cultic language provides a shared idiom for Jews and Gentiles alike, Gupta says: "What I find more tenuous is Vahrenhorst's argument that Paul purposefully employed non-Jewish cultic terminology . . . with this purpose in mind."[74] Gupta may be correct to believe that Paul did not "purposefully" use non-Jewish cultic terms, but this may be because certain cultic terms were sufficiently shared between Jews and non-Jews that Paul simply used them naturally. Indeed, Gupta says something similar to this when he notes that he is not bothered by the idea of shared cultic language "socially or phenomenologically,"[75] but he then goes on to say, "There is no reason to turn to non-Jewish usage, however, when the appearance of this wordgroup is prominent in Hellenistic Jewish literature as well."[76] One wonders why non-Jewish sources would do nothing to clarify Paul's use of cultic imagery if one accepts (as Gupta seems to) that even Jews in the first century were Hellenised in important ways. This issue of the relevance of ancient, and often non-Jewish, discussions of sacrilege for Paul's temple imagery is precisely the question I aim to study further in this thesis.

2013 – Yulin Liu: *Temple Purity in 1–2 Corinthians*

Yulin Liu's work marks an important contribution to the study of Pauline temple imagery in relation both to Jewish and Greco-Roman contexts because he considers the ways in which

[74] Gupta 2010, 24.

[75] Gupta 2010, 24.

[76] Gupta 2010, 24.

concepts of temple purity could be comprehensible to Paul's audience in 1 and 2 Corinthians. He therefore approaches Paul's writings in a manner that is similar to Vahrenhorst, although he works with a narrower set of Pauline texts (only 1 and 2 Corinthians) and a narrower selection of Greco-Roman material (data related to temple purity). He argues that "Paul's message of temple purity was able to reach his audience, whether Jewish or gentile, without difficulty."[77]

Liu's study includes lengthy analyses of two contexts. First, he surveys notions of temple purity in second temple Jewish texts. Second, he surveys notions of temple purity in the Greco-Roman world more broadly, with particular attention to the cults of Apollo, Isis, and Asklepios, all of which had a presence in Roman Corinth. He then reads passages from 1 and 2 Corinthians against these backgrounds, maintaining a focus on issues of temple purity and pollution. He posits differences between Jewish and Greco-Roman views of purity, claiming that the former is "ontological" while the latter is "relational,"[78] but concludes, despite these differences, that both groups shared a concern for temple purity. Therefore, Paul's arguments in 1 Corinthians could be compelling to a former-pagan audience.

Liu's work marks a departure from the questions of spiritualisation and origin so common to other studies of temple and cultic imagery and it invites Pauline scholars to reconsider their views of temple purity in paganism. He pushes against the supposed contrast between Jews who were committed to temple purity on the one hand and Gentiles whose worship consisted of licentious hedonism on the other.[79] While his work on Greco-Roman context is valuable, there are places where the broad similarities he notes between Greco-Roman

[77] Liu 2013, 234.

[78] Liu 2013, 25.

[79] Liu 2013, 150, is one of the few scholars who questions the reality of sacred prostitution in Corinthian temples.

temple purity and Paul's temple imagery can be more fully developed. A closer comparison between 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6 and the logic of sacrilege, as well as a reconsideration of the purpose of Paul's temple imagery, can further strengthen Liu's observations and clarify how considering Greco-Roman material related to temples can improve our reading of the Corinthian epistles.

2018 – Philip Richardson: *Temple of the Living God*

Philip Richardson, like Liu, adopts an audience-focused approach to Pauline temple imagery and compares and contrasts Paul's figurative temple language with similar language in Hellenistic Philosophy. He does this both to understand how the Corinthians might have understood his temple imagery and to achieve greater clarity about Paul's use of the temple.[80] Importantly, Richardson is *not* interested in "descriptions or attitudes toward actual temple worship in these or any sources (in other words, temple language associated with humanly constructed temple buildings)."[81] Instead, he restricts his study to figurative temple language related to the indwelling of God(s).[82] In his exegesis of 1 Corinthians 3 and 6, Richardson highlights the ways Paul's use of temple language differs from Hellenistic philosophers.[83] This includes, especially,

[80] Richardson 2018, 39. Richardson is careful not to claim that all the Corinthians must have read some philosopher or another, nor does he claim that all of the Corinthians were educated in a particular philosophical school. Instead, he claims that, "the influence of Hellenistic philosophy was pervasive in the first century" and these philosophies "trickled down" to affect the thought-world even of uneducated Greeks. See Richardson 2018, 5.

[81] Richardson 2018, 42.

[82] Richardson 2018, 43.

[83] He also clearly collects and presents a summary of these findings in Richardson 2018, 238–40.

Paul's emphasis on the community (rather than the individual) as a temple in 1 Cor 3:16–17[84] and his positive evaluation of the body in 1 Cor 6:19.[85]

Richardson's study clearly and effectively positions Paul's temple imagery within the broader context of Hellenistic philosophy, but he does not explore the same avenues of comparison that I will investigate in this thesis. For one thing, Richardson avoids references to actual temple buildings, studying instead the figurative application of temple imagery. I focus on precisely the opposite references. I aim to understand the ways in which ancient writers interpret offences against these sacred buildings and how they understand the consequences associated with such offences. For another, Richardson seems interested in the ways that Paul's figurative temple imagery differs from the similar figurative applications of Greco-Roman philosophers. So, while he rightly considers Hellenistic philosophy, he presents it in some places as a foil against which the Jewish Paul reacts. I, on the other hand, am considering whether Paul's use of such imagery follows a logic that is common to the frequent discussions of sacrilege, pollution, and judgement in ancient Greco-Roman literature.

2019 – Eyal Regev: *The Temple in Early Christianity*

Eyal Regev considers early Christian attitudes towards the Jerusalem temple as an institution and as a symbol of commitment and proximity to God.[86] He examines "virtually all the explicit treatments of the Temple and the Temple cult in the NT."[87] He classifies attitudes towards the temple according to four criteria: attendance at the temple, analogy built on comparison with the

[84] Richardson 2018, 167–68.

[85] Richardson 2018, 182–84.

[86] Regev 2019, 1.

[87] Regev 2019, 2.

temple, criticism of the temple, and rejection of the temple.[88] He concludes, against many of the scholars cited above, that the NT does not indicate an early Christian rejection of the temple, but rather continues contemporary Jewish ideas related to the temple.[89] In his discussion of Paul, he argues against Pauline scholars who read Paul's temple imagery as a spiritualisation of the temple.[90] He notes that Paul's use of the temple is too "narrow" to provide a temple replacement.[91] In his view, Paul's temple imagery shows a "high appreciation" for the Jerusalem temple cult, but it also constitutes a transformation of the cult. "Through his use of metaphors," Regev argues, "Paul has made the virtual Temple and sacrifice accessible to non-Jewish-Christians."[92]

Regev critiques older trends in Pauline scholarship, particularly spiritualisation, and his careful scholarship avoids the temptation to read too much into the text, but he does not engage discussions of sacrilege. To the extent that he does discuss non-Jewish material, he dismisses its relevance for understanding Paul's temple imagery. In one section, he asks specifically whether Paul's temple imagery uses pagan concepts, but he concludes 1) that Paul would not want to draw on pagan concepts because he wants the Corinthians to abandon idolatry and 2) that Corinthian familiarity with pagan temples is not helpful because neither Paul nor the Corinthians

[88] Regev 2019, 2.

[89] Regev 2019, 314.

[90] Regev 2019, 53–54.

[91] Regev 2019, 57. That is, he believes the temple is being applied only in a very specific way for very specific arguments, and so Paul is not constructing a complete theology of an alternative temple composed of the Corinthians (in distinction from Qumran, which Regev treats on 62–66).

[92] Regev 2019, 90. Cf. Fredriksen 2010, 250, who likewise argues for the centrality of the temple as a way to incorporate Gentiles. She says, "The Temple remains absolutely central, driving all of Paul's messy metaphors for Jesus' death as a sacrifice. No less importantly, it also supplies the chief terms by which Paul conceptualizes the incorporation of his pagans-in-Christ into Israel's redemption." See also Macaskill 2013, 170, who sees the eschatological temple "as a new reality containing both Jew and Gentile.'

thought the Holy Spirit lived in pagan temples.[93] His approach thereby assumes a serious disjunction between concepts of temples held by first-century Jews, and concepts held by others.

2020 – Michael Suh: *Power and Peril*

Michael Suh's recent monograph deals precisely with temple discourse in 1 Corinthians, but his approach differs noticeably from the other works collected above. Suh does not study the passages that include explicit temple imagery (i.e., 1 Cor 3:16–17, 1 Cor 6:19, and 2 Cor 6:16) but instead aims to unpack what Paul means when he calls the Corinthians God's temple in 1 Cor 3:16–17 by considering other passages in 1 Corintians.[94] More specifically, he argues that 1 Cor 5:1–13, 10:1–22, and 11:17–34 contain references to the church's gathering together that illuminate the nature of the ἐκκλησία as a temple and reveal how Paul conceives of the power in its midst and the peril that lies at its boundaries. He pursues comprehension both of the import and origin of Paul's temple discourse, thus returning again to questions dating back to Wenschkewitz. He considers both Jewish and other Greco-Roman data for comparison, without supposing that non-Jewish material has no relevance for the study of Paul. He concludes: "For Paul, the Corinthians as temple meant that it is the locus where members can experience the power of God in a variety of ways. But as temple, they also remained vulnerable to dangerous consequences for transgressions."[95]

Suh's work shares some significant features with mine. He avoids limiting his study to the Jerusalem temple as if it were the only relevant temple for understanding Paul's use of

[93] Regev 2019, 67.

[94] Suh 2020, 5.

[95] Suh 2020, 214.

temple imagery.[96] He also draws out, to a greater degree than any of the others in this survey, not only the benefits of sacred spaces, but also the dangers associated with violations of them. He notes that this sense of danger is true both for Paul and for other writers in the ancient world more broadly, even going so far as to say, "Paul's premise that offending the god can lead to punishments (especially in the framework of sacred space) is a shared premise found in other Greeks and Romans."[97] My thesis approaches this topic from a different angle, however. While Suh looks to 1 Cor 5, 10, and 11 to illuminate 1 Cor 3,[98] I will study 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 directly to determine the extent to which they reflect the concepts of sacrilege that are seen so often in other ancient, Greco-Roman literature. What is more, while Suh does draw out the potential danger of violating the sacred, he does not analyse sacrilege specifically, and does not fully delineate the logic undergirding the connection between violations of the sacred and judgement.[99] I aim to do both.

1.1.2 – Conclusion

This survey of scholarship reveals four recurring themes that are worth noting for the purpose of this thesis. The first is the issue of spiritualisation. Much of this scholarship seems rooted in a certain hesitancy regarding physical sacred spaces and holy buildings. This hesitancy manifests in the view that Paul must be spiritualising or replacing the concrete cultic institutions of

[96] At the conclusion of his history of interpretation he notes, "Whether implicitly or explicitly, the Jerusalem cult remains the background structure that informs their [his interlocutors'] interpretations of Paul," and he urges that other areas require "further elaboration." Suh 2020, 11.

[97] Suh 2020, 152.

[98] And he omits analysis of 1 Cor 6:19 altogether.

[99] See Suh 2020, chap. 3.

Judaism.[100] This is seen, of course, in the early work of scholars such as Wenschkewitz, but the trend continues throughout the literature, even in the face of scholarship that pushes against the spiritualisation reading. There is potential value, then, in considering anew how ancient people viewed temples and offences against them, and asking how Paul, as a first-century writer, might have drawn from such concerns to buttress his arguments against division and πορνεία.

The second issue is the question of origin. Many studies of Paul's temple imagery cited above debate whether Paul was influenced by the OT, the Qumran texts, a Jewish critique of the Jerusalem temple, or Stoic philosophy in his formulation of temple imagery. This scholarship has revealed that the application of temple imagery to a person(s) is not unheard of either in Jewish or non-Jewish contexts in the ancient world. A further question we can now ask, then, is whether Paul's particular application of temple imagery in 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6 follows a pattern of thinking unique to the OT or some other exclusively Jewish framework, or whether, in some important ways, the rhetorical force of Paul's argument coheres with concepts of temple and sacrilege common in the Greco-Roman world more broadly.

The third issue is the way Jewish and Greco-Roman material is dichotomised. Many scholars do not adequately analyse the extent to which Jewish material in the first century coheres with or deviates from other Greco-Roman material, or they fail to acknowledge that first-century Judaism is a kind of Hellenised Judaism. This can lead to acting as if Jewish concepts are totally unlike anything found in Greco-Roman (as in, non-Jewish) writings, as well as to conflating the theology displayed in OT texts with the theology of Jews in the first century. With this supposed Jewish/Greco-Roman distinction in place, a majority of scholars working on

[100] So Suh 2020, 8.

Paul's temple imagery either do not put much weight on non-Jewish, Greco-Roman data,[101] or else they dismiss such data's relevance and/or distance Paul from it.[102]

This is closely tied to a fourth issue, namely, the consideration of concepts of sacrilege as a tool for understanding Paul's temple imagery. The tendency to divide rigidly Jewish material from Greco-Roman material is likely part of the reason that no monograph has yet considered sacrilege in any detail, despite the similarities between stories of sacrilege and judgement in ancient literature and 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6. Liu and Suh come the closest to an analysis of sacrilege, but neither studies 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6 systematically in conversation with these concepts. Liu is more concerned with Greco-Roman notions of temple purity in general than in the specific comparison of Paul's imagery in 1 Cor 3 and Cor 6 with concepts of sacrilege.[103] Suh does look at the danger associated with sacred spaces, but does not exegete 1 Cor 3:16–17 or 1 Cor 6:19 at all.[104]

While the work done so far on Pauline temple imagery is valuable, there are potential gains to be made by considering this imagery afresh in conversation with ancient discussions of sacrilege. This research will not only fill a gap in the current scholarship on this topic, but also allow us to reach greater clarity about how a first-century Jew could think about temples, threats against them, and the consequences of such threats for the perpetrators. Moreover, this research could help us understand why Paul uses temple imagery in the specific locations that he does in 1

[101] E.g., Gärtner 1965; Daly 1978; Beale 2004. Similarly, see Coppens 1973.

[102] E.g., Klinzing 1971; Hogeterp 2006; Wardle 2010; Gupta 2010; Regev 2019.

[103] Liu 2013.

[104] Suh 2020.

Corinthians, and how he uses it. One may ask, however, why one would limit analysis to temple imagery in 1 Corinthians alone, without reference to other Pauline (or NT) texts?

1.2 – Selection of Texts: The Temple in 1 Corinthians Alone

In this thesis, I limit my analysis to the two instances of linguistically explicit temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:18–19 and their surrounding contexts. The majority of scholars in my history of interpretation take a decidedly different approach and deal with a much broader selection of texts. Some, for example, examine Paul's "cultic" imagery in general, without restricting that analysis to the image of the temple.[105] Others look at the temple not only in 1 Corinthians, but also in other texts across the biblical canon.[106] These approaches illuminate how Paul uses cultic language, clarify aspects of his theology, and track the trajectory of concepts of the temple from the OT to the NT. They also provide insight into the way that other first-century, Jewish writers appeal to and employ the language of "temple." There are, however, two key reasons to study temple imagery in 1 Corinthians alone in this thesis, without trying to build a composite picture from Paul's temple imagery in other texts.

The first reason is that each instance of temple imagery in the Pauline epistles (namely, 1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:21)[107] is embedded in particular arguments. When Paul calls the Corinthians God's temple, we can assume he thought this statement would support his arguments in the particular letter in which the statement is located. Asking what his temple imagery says about his theology of the temple is a decidedly different sort of question from

[105] E.g., Strack 1994; Vahrenhorst 2008; Gupta 2010.

[106] E.g., McKelvey 1969; Beale 2004.

[107] The final reference is dependent, of course, on whether one accepts Pauline authorship of this epistle.

asking why he uses the temple in the specific contexts of 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6 and how the temple might support the arguments there. I am interested in the latter two questions.

The second reason is that Paul's unique applications of temple imagery demonstrate differing levels of similarity to discussions of temples and sacrilege in other ancient literature and I wish to avoid reading the elements of one text into another.[108] As I noted in the introduction, in 1 Cor 3:16–17, Paul is concerned that someone will "destroy" (φθείρω) the holy temple and there is a declaration that God will "destroy" the offender in turn. This mirrors a common pattern in discussions of sacrilege. In 1 Cor 6:19, πορνεία is presented as a sin against the body and a threat to the temple's holiness. This too resembles threats against temple sanctity found in discussions of sacrilege.[109] On the other hand, in 2 Cor 6:15 Paul does not use language

[108] This is completely opposite to some Pauline scholarship. Consider Daly 1978, 61, who says of Eph 2:19–22: "The best guidelines for interpreting this passage are 1 Cor 3:5–17, which speaks from a somewhat different viewpoint, and Eph 4:11–16, which gives the same message while using only the metaphor of the body."

[109] My approach in regards to this text and non-Jewish, Greco-Roman material runs against much scholarship on 1 Corinthians, which assumes that πορνεία was a regular feature of Corinthian temples and concludes that non-Jewish material is therefore irrelevant for the application of temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19. Some scholars think Corinthian temples may have been the location of the Corinthians' πορνεία (e.g., Rosner 1998, 349–50). Others think that Paul's temple imagery in this passage pushes precisely against pagan concepts of temples and their association with immoral sex. Robertson and Plummer say, "In the temple of Aphrodite at Corinth, πορνεία was regarded as *consecration*: the Corinthians are told here that it is a monstrous *desecration*" (Robertson and Plummer 1950, 128). Many other scholars associate immoral sex with pagan temples including: Findlay 1897, 821; Moffat 1938; McKelvey 1969, 103; Witherington 1995, 13–14; Garrison 1997, 29; Keener 2005, 59; N.T. Wright 2013b, 376; Lim 2017, 138; Regev 2019, 58, n. 29; Campbell 2020, 508–9 and 558. The scholars cited here represent a variety of approaches to Paul, and their chronological spread demonstrates the persistence of this view of pagan temples.

Scholars often cite Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.6.20 in order to claim that the temple of Aphrodite was the site of extensive prostitution, but Strabo's description of a massive temple of Aphrodite filled with "temple-slaves" (ἱεροδούλαι) and "courtesans" (ἑταῖραι) is not relevant for 1 Corinthians because it is not talking about any temple still standing in the Roman era. Strabo makes this explicit in his text. He contrasts the old temple, with its temple slaves, with the temple that stood in his day (after Roman colonisation in 44 BCE). He says, "Now the summit has a small temple of Aphrodite" (ἡ μὲν οὖν κορυφὴ ναΐδιον ἔχει Ἀφροδίτης) (Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.6.21 [Jones]).

Scholars who question whether there were prostitutes in Corinthian temples include Conzelmann 1967; 1975, 12; Winter 2001, 87–88; Lanci 2005; Liu 2013, 150. For other discussions of sacred prostitution in the OT, NT, and ancient world more broadly, see Beard and Henderson 1998; Baugh 1999; Budin 2006 and 2008; Ipsen 2009; DeGrado 2018.

that indicates a threat against the temple. Moreover, Paul's argument there implicitly and explicitly draws from the OT in a way that 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 do not. Implicitly, Paul affirms the incompatability of God's temple with idolatry, a serious pollutant in the OT but not in other ancient literature. Explicitly, Paul's argument includes lengthy citations of OT texts that anchor his use of temple imagery to the OT tradition in an explicit way. In Eph 2:19–21 the author uses a variety of words found in 1 Cor 3:10–17,[110] but in a distinctive context. Lacking here is any threat against the temple or its sanctity, or any sign that temple desecration invites judgement from God. With this in mind, I restrict my analysis here to 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 and aim to consider whether and how Paul follows a common logic of sacrilege in these texts, specifically.

1.3 – Terminology

I have so far urged that concepts of sacrilege and judgment found in ancient literature are potentially valuable for illuminating our understanding of 1 Corinthians. I surveyed key secondary literature, tracing notable lines of development and finding no sustained analysis of this topic. I explained my decision to restrict analysis to temple imagery in 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6 alone, without reference to other Pauline (or non-Pauline) temple imagery in the NT. Before providing my chapter outline, it is important to offer several brief remarks concerning my understanding of temple "imagery," and my use of the term "pagan" and "temple."

1.3.1 – The Temple Image as a Metaphor

I accept that Paul's temple imagery is, in the most basic sense, a metaphor. That is, to use the language of Janet Soskice, this image speaks "of one thing or state of affairs in language

[110] These words include ἐποικοδομέω, θεμέλιος, οἰκοδομή, ναός, ἅγιος, and πνεῦμα.

suggestive of another."[111] In this case, Paul speaks of one thing (the community or the bodies of the community members) in terms of another thing (the temple). It is vital to note, however, that the use of metaphor does indicate whether the statement is "true" or not. With N.T. Wright, I do not treat the temple as a "mere metaphor" employed as a sort of *ad hoc* analogy.[112] Rather, the image of the temple builds on Paul's conviction that the Holy Spirit dwells in the community and that the community is called to be holy, in a manner that is analogous to the temple indwelt by God and sanctified by his presence. Paul's temple imagery is thus essential for expressing his views concerning the community's holy nature, the community's potential to act contrary to this nature, and the consequences that might result from such behaviour.

1.3.2 – The Use of "Pagan" and "Temple"

I will sometimes refer to cults of the Greco-Roman world as "pagan" cults or as examples of "paganism," and I will occasionally ponder the extent or kind of differences between concepts found frequently in "pagan" contexts and those found in Jewish or early Christian ones. The use of the word "pagan" is not without its detractors, however. Garth Fowden, in particular, critiques its use, claiming the Christian use of "paganism" was shorthand for a range of cults that were "painted in the most lurid possible colors" by Christian authors.[113] Other classicists accept that the label is, in Lane Fox's words, a "Christian coinage."[114] Some Biblical scholars, too, have reservations about the label. John Barclay refuses to use "the pejorative term 'pagan' with

[111] Soskice 1985, 50–51.

[112] N.T. Wright 2013b, 712, argues, "This is no mere metaphor, a random image culled from Paul's fertile imagination."

[113] Fowden 1993, 38. See also Fowden 1988, 1998.

[114] Fox 2011, 31. Nonetheless, Fox does still use the term himself.

respect to non-Jews."[115] Although Alan Cameron suggests Christians may have started using "pagan" because it was *less* pejorative than some alternatives,[116] I find his argument not wholly convincing. Rita Testa, in particular, critiques his approach by asking whether one can label a group as "other" without implying at least some derogatory intent.[117]

These critics of the word "pagan" raise good points, and I am sensitive to the mis-characterisation of pagan cults, but I will nonetheless use "pagan" occasionally to draw comparisons between cults. I do this, in part, because "pagan" is a cultic designation rather than an ethnic or cultural designation such as "Gentile" or "Greco-Roman"[118] and at some points my concern will be more closely related to cultic matters than ethnic ones. Moreover, while Judaism is a discernible cult in the Greco-Roman world, it remains, nonetheless, a Greco-Roman cult, and so a contrast between Judaism and something like "Greco-Romanism" only reinforces the supposed dichotomy between Jewish and Greco-Roman material that I mentioned earlier. I use "pagan" also because I do not find proposed alternatives to "pagan" to be any better. Fowden, for examples, suggests "polytheism" as a replacement for "paganism" and uses this term extensively in his own writing.[119] However, it is not clear that this label is any less pejorative,[120] nor that it is any more precise since many pagans in the ancient world displayed a monotheistic inclination.

---

[115] Barclay 1996, 15.

[116] Cameron 2011, 20.

[117] Testa 2013, 41.

[118] So Fredriksen 2017, 34. Of course, the religious and the ethnic were closely related in the ancient world. See also Fredriksen 2015.

[119] See Fowden 1993 and Fowden 1998.

[120] So Cameron 2011, 28–29. Consider, for example, references to polytheism in Philo. He claims those who are affiliated with "that evil thing called polytheism" (τῷ πολυθέῳ λεγομένῳ κακῷ) cause strife and war throughout the world (Philo, *Confusion* 11.42). Basil, *Letters* 189 calls polytheism an error (πλάνη). Procopius, *Buildings* 6.2.16 treats polytheism as something that makes one sick (νοσέω).

I will use the word "temple" to refer to those buildings that are usually built on sacred spaces, that are supposed to contain a divine presence, and that usually house an image of a god or gods. I will adopt this practice rather than using the variety of Greek and Latin words that appear in the various sources. This is because, in addition to the words that carry the more specific meaning of "temple" or "shrine" (for example, ναός and ἱερόν) there are also several instances in which words like οἶκος are used to refer to temples, and words like Ἀπολλώνιος and Ἀφροδίσιος refer to temples belonging to specific deities. In order to avoid unnecessary confusion, I will simply say "temple."

1.4 – Project Map

In this thesis, I consider whether Paul's use of temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 draws on a common logic of sacrilege. My study will proceed as follows:

Chapter 2: In chapter 2, I will examine more closely the logic of sacrilege and judgement with which I aim to compare Paul's temple imagery. I will first explain my selection of materials. I will urge that in a wide selection of ancient literature there is a discernible and common system of pollution that undergirds discussions of sacrilege and that can be categorised in terms of physical and minor metaphysical pollution on the one hand, and major metaphysical pollution on the other. I will then analyse this system of pollution closely. This will involve considering the causes of this pollution and its link to sacrilege, the terms used to label this pollution, the detrimental effects that can be associated with this pollution, and the means by which one resolves this pollution. Throughout this chapter, I will also consider whether this system differs from discussions of moral and ritual pollution in the OT, and draw out how one might determine whether Paul's temple imagery relies on one or the other of the pollution

systems. This analysis will provide the primary context within which I will investigate Paul's temple imagery.

Chapter 3: In this chapter, I will consider the use of major metaphysical pollution in two first-century Jewish writers, Josephus and Philo. Many scholars suggest that concepts of temples found amonag pagan writers are irrelevant for the study of a first-century Jew like Paul, so in this chapter I will consider whether and how these other first-century Jewish writers adopt a logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution. In particular, I will ask about the relationship between this pollution and instances of judgement. This analysis will do two things for the thesis. On the one hand, it will reveal whether non-Jews had an exclusive claim to these concepts of pollution and judgement and whether it is historically plausible that Paul, another first-century Jew, could use such concepts in relation to temples. On the other hand, it will help us clarify both how and why Paul might employ these particular concepts.

Chapter 4: This chapter contains the first of my detailed exegetical work. Here, I will systematically compare the way Paul uses temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16–17 with the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution. I will ask whether the cause, effect, and means of resolution associated with major metaphysical pollution are discernible in Paul's use of temple imagery, and if his use of temple imagery is therefore cohesive with ancient discussions of sacrilege. I will also consider the ways in which Paul's use of this pollution or lack thereof compares to Josephus and Philo. I will conclude with comments about how positioning Paul's temple imagery in the context of ancient concepts of sacrilege and pollution might shift our understanding of the temple in its rhetorical location.

Chapter 5: My exegesis continues with an analysis of 1 Cor 6:19. As in the previous chapter, I will work meticulously through 1 Cor 6:19 and compare its features with the features

of major metaphysical pollution. I will consider whether this passage, although making a distinct point from 1 Cor 3:16–17, reveals the same cause, effect, and means of resolution associated with major metaphysical pollution, and so coheres with discussions of sacrilege in other literature. I will also consider the ways in which my reading of Paul may parallel Josephus and Philo. I will conclude with comments about how positioning Paul's temple imagery in the context of ancient discussions of sacrilege could change the way we understand the role of the temple in Paul's argument in 1 Cor 6.

Chapter 6: I will conclude this thesis with a summary of the results. I will first simply summarise the arguments presented. I will then offer conclusions related to what this thesis says about Paul and about his letter to the Corinthians. I will close with some brief comments on areas for further research that could build on the work I have done here.

CHAPTER 2 – SACRILEGE, POLLUTION, AND JUDGEMENT

2.1 – Introduction

In the previous chapter, I highlighted similarities between stories of sacrilege in ancient literature and the temple imagery found in 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19, and I raised the question: does Paul's use of temple imagery in these passages draw on concepts of sacrilege common in the ancient Greco-Roman world, and if we answer in the affirmative, does that change our understanding of the temple's role in its rhetorical context in these texts? In this chapter, I begin to address this question by considering closely the logic of sacrilege and judgement. I will ask three main groups of questions as I survey a wide range of ancient literature. 1) Is there a discernible system by which discussions of sacrilege, pollution, and judgement operate and how does that system work? 2) Does the pattern of this system differ from what we find in OT discussions of temple, pollution, exile, and judgement, and if so, how? 3) Most importantly, how would we know if Paul's application of temple imagery draws on this system as opposed to or in combination with OT discussions of the temple?

This chapter will proceed in two major sections. First, I will delineate my selection of texts and explain the nature of their relevance both for describing the logic of sacrilege and for understanding Paul and the Corinthians. Second, with reference to these texts, I will begin to sketch the ways that sacrilege, pollution, and judgement are connected in the ancient world. As I proceed through this section, I will attempt not only to define the system that undergirds discussions of sacrilege, but also to highlight differences between this system and the discussions of the temple in the OT. Further, I will repeatedly draw attention to how we can determine

whether Paul's use of temple imagery demonstrates coherence with this system. I will also provide two summary tables to which I will refer throughout this work. The first will delineate the main features of this system (i.e., the cause, language, effect, and resolution of pollution) in a broad selection of texts. The second will summarize key points for this thesis and the discussion of temple sacrilege in particular. My analysis will create a framework within which to read the temple references in 1 Corinthians in later chapters.

2.2 – Texts and Sources: The Relevance of Literary Data for Roman Corinth

In this thesis I am comparing temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 with the many discussions of sacrilege in other ancient texts. While the greatest weight is placed on texts from the late Republican and early Imperial period, I frequently cite texts from earlier periods. I also reference texts written in various genres, by authors with differing philosophical commitments, and by writers living in a variety of places across the ancient Mediterranean world. There are two reasons that I engage with this wide range of sources instead of restricing my study to sources from Roman Corinth. First, when we study ancient Greco-Roman thought and the various cults of Greco-Roman paganism, we have no authoritative texts that explain all of the rituals and practices of a cult or that provide doctrines of pagan belief.[1] Moreover, there is no clear sacred/secular distinction in Greco-Roman societies. When we want to ask how the ancients thought about and talked about "religious" issues, we must often draw from texts representing a variety of genres. Second, while there are numerous academic volumes and essay collections that

[1] Texts like Varro's *Antiquities* are unfortunately not available in their full form, and the references found in Augustine's writings are chosen as a foil for Augustine's own position. Burkert 1985, 5, notes the lack of a Torah-like source for ancient Greece, but he provides a helpful discussion of sources for the study of Greek religion, as do Parker 1983, 12–17; Beard, North, and Price 1998, *passim*. For the collected fragments of Varro, see Cardauns 1976.

deal specifically with Roman Corinth,[2] as well as collections and discussions of literary references[3] and archaeological or numismatic data,[4] serious limitations remain. The literary references are often made in passing and even those that describe the city in greater detail provide insufficient data for the construction of a specifically Corinthian view of temple sacrilege and judgement.[5] The material evidence reveals much about the social composition, value system, and political orientation of the colony,[6] but again, does not provide insight into the concepts of temple sacrilege and judgement prevalent there during the first century.

The breadth of my literary sources provides unique opporunities for this study, however. The analysis that follows in this chapter reveals that there are remarkable consistencies found across these texts in how they discuss temples, sacrilege, pollution, and judgement. This suggests that there is a discernible and widespread system of pollution to which numerous ancient people appealed, perhaps subconsciously, in their discussions of sacrilege. Its basic shape is found in writers ranging from Sophocles to Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, and Appian, among many others. The fact that a similar logic is followed in so many different kinds of texts does not prove that every writer "believed" in the system I present. It does, however, indicate that such a system was often assumed to be comprehensible. So, considering these texts together helps us more

[2] These works include, e.g., Engels 1990; Winter 2001; Adams and Horrell 2004; Schowalter and Friesen 2005; Friesen and Walters 2010; J. R. Harrison and Welborn 2015, 2016; Pettegrew 2016.

[3] The collection of literary references to Corinth in Murphy-O'Connor 2002 remains valuable.

[4] Such as Spawforth 1996; Bitner 2015a, and numerous other evidence collected and published by The American School of Classical Studies at Athens such as the inscriptions found in IKorinthKent.

[5] Some texts do refer to religious practices related to temples, such as Apuleius, *Metam.* 11.23, which describes cleansing prior to entry to the innermost part of the temple of Isis. Unfortunately, these texts are quite limited in the data they provide.

[6] Such material can be put to good use by scholars such as Clarke 2006, who provides evidence of secular categories and perceptions of leadership in Roman Corinth and places these data in conversation with 1 Corinthians, or by Concannon 2014, who studies the place of ethnicity in the Corinthian correspondence.

effectively to position Paul's application of temple imagery within a broad context of ancient writers.

As a word of clarification, I focus on literary data rather than epigraphic data because I want to examine how these writers understand violations of temple sanctity and crimes against the gods, how they link such offences to judgement, and how they draw on the system of sacrilege, pollution, and judgement in their writing. This approach is distinct from many other Pauline scholars who are interested in Greco-Roman contexts but focus on material evidence and/or sacred laws.[7] These data illuminate the process of Greek temple building and reveal the importance of ritual norms for Greco-Roman cults. They are also useful for comparing Pauline vocabulary with Greek religious and construction vocabulary, or for comparing purity regulations between the Jerusalem temple and pagan temples. Nonetheless, in a sense, these inscriptions expose only the "outward face of the cult."[8] That is, while these inscriptions may claim, for example, that temple desecrators must be killed or that they will be punished by the gods,[9] they do not necessarily tell us how anyone connected specific instances of death or tragedy to such desecration, nor do they reveal the logic by which people made connections between sacrilege, pollution, and judgement. I focus on literature, then, because I am more

[7] E.g., Shanor 1988; Lanci 1997; Vahrenhorst 2008; Bitner 2015b; Suh 2020.

[8] Burkert 1985, 5.

[9] For example, *SEG* XLIII 710 warns that evil men who enter a temple will be punished. Similarly, the warning sign from the Temple Mount in Jerusalem (possibly referenced in Josephus, *J.W.* 5.94) warns that foreigners who enter the temple are responsible for their own death (CIIP 2). These inscriptions alone, however, do not tell us if anyone was ever actually put to death for such a temple violation. Nor do they tell us whether anyone ever suffered from any illness or other tragedy that was subsequently interpreted as the result of temple violation.

A valuable discussion of Greek Sacred Law, along with a number of inscriptions and texts, is found in Lupu 2009. Scholars who examine notions of purity, pollution, and cultic regulations as they appear in sacred law include Chaniotis 2012; Robertson 2013; Karatas 2020.

interested in *interpretations* of sacrilegious acts and their consequences than in the identification of particular "cathartic requirements" found at particular temples.[10]

Having discussed my selection of texts, I can now turn to the task of investigating these texts. In the next section I will work to define the shape of the system by which discussions of sacrilege operate.

2.3 – Pollution, Purification, and Judgement in Ancient Literature

In the following analysis of sacrilege, pollution, and judgement, my task here is Threefold. First, I will delineate the distinctions between two primary categories of pollution in ancient literature. Not all pollutions have the same effect or lead to the same consequences, and understanding the varieties of pollution is essential to understanding sacrilege and its particular relationship to judgement. I label these categories "physical and minor metaphysical pollution" and "major metaphysical pollution."[11] I will provide an overview of the causes, terminology, effects, and means of resolution for both, but I will focus particularly on major metaphysical pollution because it is more closely connected to sacrilege.

Second, it is critical to note how major metaphysical pollution differs from notions of purity and pollution in the OT, because my thesis asks whether, in some important ways, Paul's temple imagery appeals to the categories of major metaphysical pollution over and against those categories expressed in the OT. Scholars of the OT frequently argue that one can distinguish

[10] Lupu 2009, 14. I also do not make here any attempt to deal with issues such as magic or personal religion. For a study of Greek religion that does deal with such topics, see Kindt 2012.

[11] I am using the language of Petrovic and Petrovic 2016, 25–32, to whom I am greatly indebted on this topic, but others use their own labels such as "ritual" purity/impurity and "taboo" (e.g., Bendlin 2007, 179). The key point for these writers, regardless of the particular labels they attach to these kinds of pollution, is that not all pollution is the same and there is a meaningful distinction to note between those pollutions towards which the gods seem unconcerned, and those that find their source "in a sacrilegious act" and towards which the gods respond with judgement (Parker 1983, 8–9).

between "ritual" pollution and "moral" pollution across the books of that canon.[12] I will draw on their work throughout this chapter and note points of difference between these two systems of pollution. In particular, I will consider how the system of major metaphysical pollution evidences concern or lack thereof about the loss of the gods' presence, how judgement in the case of major metaphysical pollution is realized against individual guilty persons and how it affects the broader community, how judgement relates to the polluted temples themselves, and whether and how judgement can be prevented through acts of atonement. Of course, the OT does not tell us how first-century Jews who were influenced by it discussed purity and pollution, so I will consider purity and pollution in the writings of two, first-century Jews (Josephus and Philo) in the next chapter.

Third, as I work through this pollution system and compare it with the OT, I will also consider the relevance of these distinctions for Paul. Most vitally, if the logic of major metaphysical pollution differs from the logic of temple pollution in the OT, then how would we know the extent to which Paul appeals to one system or the other in any particular passage? As this chapter proceeds, I will offer suggestions as to how we might determine, exegetically, on what system Paul draws.

2.3.1 –Physical and Minor Metaphysical Pollution in Ancient Literature

[12] Ritual pollution is acquired primarily from contact with certain substances such as childbirth (Lev 12:1–8), genital discharge (Lev 15), and corpses (Num 19:11–22). Moral pollution is more commonly created by the familiar objects of OT polemic, namely, sexual sin (Lev 18, 20:10–16; Deut 24:1–4), idolatry (Lev 20:1–3; Deut 7:25–27; 2 Kgs 21; Jer 44; Ezek 8–11), and bloodshed (Lev 35:33–34; Ezek 18:10–13; Prov 6:16–17).

Fuller discussions of pollution in the OT are found in Frymer-Kensky 1983; D. Wright 1992; Milgrom 1992; and Klawans 1995; 1997; 2000; 2006. H. K. Harrington 1993, also sees these OT discussions of purity and pollution as foundational to later Jewish groups such as the Qumran community and the rabbis. When I say "ritual" and "moral" pollution, I am using language found in Klawans 2000, 22–30; and in Klawans 1995, 1997, 2006 *passim*.

I turn first to a brief description of physical and minor metaphysical pollutions. These pollutions are related to substances or acts that are forbidden in the context of sacred spaces and temples, but which are not problematic in themselves and which may not even be avoidable in daily life.[13] Indeed, humans *must* come into contact with many of these things on a regular basis. Childbirth and the associated bodily processes,[14] sexual intercourse,[15] and contact with corpses[16] are some of the most commonly identified impure items. Minor metaphysical pollutions can also result from certain types of minor ritual mistakes, such as entering the temple while wearing a prohibited kind of clothing. Although these acts can create a minor pollution, they do not constitute an act of sacrilege or an offence against the gods, and so they do not lead to the same consequences as major metaphysical pollution (detailed below).[17]

Physical and minor metaphysical pollutions are commonly indicated by μίασμα and related μια- words, and, while they can be contact contagious, their effects are relatively

[13] Bendlin 2007, 179.

[14] Pausanias, *Descr.* 2.27.1, describes a bounded grove of Asclepius in which "No death or birth takes place" [Jones]. Temple Inscriptions often restrict access for those who are pregnant, breastfeeding, or menstruating. See *NewDocs* 4.25; *LSS* 54.

[15] A well-known example is Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 2.64: "It was the Egyptians who first made it a matter of religious observance not to have intercourse with women in temples, nor enter a temple after such intercourse without washing. Nearly all other men are less careful in this matter than are the Egyptians and Greeks" [Godley].

[16] See again Pausanias *Descr.* 2.27.1. Plutarch, *Stoic. rep.* 1044 F – 1045 A brings together corpse impurity and sexual impurity under the heading of items that might pollute a temple (ἱερόν). Here "cohabitation with mothers or daughters or sisters, eating certain things, and going directly from childbed or death-bed to a holy place" are all cited as acts that some believe can pollute (μιαίνω) a god. Note also that proximity to a death-bed is not, apparently, problematic in itself, but it becomes so if one goes immediately from there to a temple.

[17] Günther 2013, 256–58, further clarifies that not *all* violations of a temple's regulations (e.g., wearing the wrong sorts of clothes) are also violations of the temple's purity. He cites a 3rd century BCE *lex sacra* that forbids certain types of clothing, rings, and sandals in the temple. If one did bring the wrong clothes into the temple, the offensive items were consecrated (that is, taken from the offender and kept in the temple), but this did not require a process of purification, nor did the mistaken person suffer violent punishment (contra the responses to major metaphysical pollutions examined below). Karatas 2020 offers a more focused analysis of dress codes in Greek sanctuaries.

inconsequential. When one is polluted by a minor pollution, he or she is considered ritually impure and therefore barred from sacred spaces and from other ritual contexts until he or she can be purified.[18] Means of purification vary, but often include washing or allowing a set time period to pass.[19] Acquiring physical and minor metaphysical pollution is not necessarily a moral offence, it is not automatically constitutive of sacrilege, and it does not necessarily lead to judgement. One would only need to avoid polluting matter immediately prior to entering a temple or undergoing certain rituals.

Describing these pollutions is important precisely because they are *not* normally dangerous. In contrast to these, pollutions that invite the greatest threat are those resulting from acts viewed as sacrilegious or as direct offence against the deity and his or her possessions. I turn now to these more serious offences and their relationship to pollution and judgement in order to explain their causes, the way they are labelled, their effects, their means of resolution, and the significance of all these things for the question of whether Paul appealed to a logic of sacrilege common in the ancient, Greco-Roman world.

2.3.2 – Major Metaphysical Pollution in Ancient Literature

2.3.2.1 – Causes of Major Metaphysical Pollution

I turn now to the more important category of major metaphysical pollution. This pollution is caused only by direct offences against the gods, and these offences tend to cluster around

[18] Parker 1983, 4. Hippocrates, *Mord. sacr.* 4.59–60 notes: "We ourselves fix boundaries to the sanctuaries and precincts of the gods, so that nobody may cross them unless he be pure; and when we enter we sprinkle ourselves, not as defiling ourselves thereby, but to wash away any pollution we may have already contracted" [Jones].

[19] Many of the instructions pertaining to purification from physical pollution are found in epigraphic evidence. E.g., washing as purification appears in *LSS* 91 and requirements to abstain from certain items for a designated amount of time prior to entering a temple is found in *LSS* 54. Dozens of other inscriptions could be similarly cited on this topic.

temples and the sacred. Sacrilege (often labelled ἱεροσυλία or ἀσέβεια) in all its forms such as temple robbery,[20] the destruction of sacred space,[21] harming a god's image or removing it from a temple,[22] or the violation of a temple's purity through sex[23] or corpse impurity,[24] can create major metaphysical pollution. Similarly, bloodshed in a temple or the removal of suppliants from a temple could also create major pollution.[25] There are several other common causes of this pollution such as extreme sexual deviance (incest is a prime example),[26] or failure to respect the gods' commands,[27] but for this project it is most important to note the connection between sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution.

---

[20] Temple robbery and accusations of temple robbery appear regularly in Diodorus Siculus. The narrative of the Sacred War in book 16 revolves around violations of sacred land and improper use, sale, or theft of sacred objects from Delphi. Certainly, there are also political factors at work in this account, but the fact that violence against temple robbers is justified (see, e.g., 16.28.4) speaks to the seriousness of temple robbery. Cf. the several other instances of temple robbery in Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 16.51.6–16.58.6. See also Appian, *Hist. rom.* 11.66.

[21] Whether temples (as in Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 8.144) or other sacred things such as groves (as in Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 51.8.3).

[22] In Aeschylus, *Pers.* 805–26 and Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 5.85 it is removing a god's image that is dangerous. In Demosthenes, *Timocr.* 24.121 it is the actual destruction or mutilation of the image that is problematic. The fear created by the mutilation of sacred images is also revealed in texts describing the impiety trials of Athens in 415, such as Plutarch, *Alc*.

[23] In Pausanias, *Descr.* 7.19.3–6, two people have sex in a temple and Artemis responds by inflicting crop failure, disease, and seemingly indiscriminate physical harm. This instance highlights the contrast between physical and major metaphysical pollution. Sex outside of a temple results in the former, while sex in a temple leads to the latter.

[24] The contrast with physical pollution is again, important to note here. Contact with the dead outside of a sacred space is not usually problematic. When human remains are brought into contact with the altars in Sophocles, *Ant.* 999–1032, however, they impede interaction with the gods. Note also the frequent reference to people leaving temples before death in order to protect the sanctity of sacred space in texts such as Plutarch, *Dem.* 29.6.

[25] Thucydides, *Hist.* 1.126; Plutarch, *Rom.* 23.1–24.3.

[26] Plato, *Leg. 838-9*; Sophocles, *OT* 1425; Euripides, *Phoen.* 1045–1050; Pseudo-Plutarch, [*Par. Min.* 310 C]; Aelian, *Nat. an.* 6.39.

[27] Aeschines, *Ctes.* 3.105–122, records an interesting story in which both sacrilege and disobedience cause pollution and danger. The original infraction against the gods in this story is an act of impiety (ἀσεβέω) against the temple (ἱερόν) and votive offerings (ἀναθήματα) at Delphi. However, as the story unfolds, pollution is incurred also by people who violate the commands of the gods and work forbidden, sacred land, as well as by people who refuse to punish the sacrilegious people.

While sacrilege is one of the most common sources of major metaphysical pollution, writers demonstrate flexibility in the way they might reinterpret novel actions as sacrilege. Aristotle tells a story of Dionysius of Syracuse, who claimed Demeter appeared to him and asked for women in the city to bring their jewellery to her temple. He then ordered everyone to comply, arguing that failure to do so would constitute an act of sacrilege (ἱεροσυλίας) that would invite the anger of the goddess (μήνιμα παρὰ τῆς θεοῦ).[28] Under normal circumstances, women did not commit sacrilege simply by *not* giving all of their jewellery to the temple, nor is owning jewellery a usual condition for creating pollution. What this story demonstrates, however, is that one could reinterpret some action (or inaction) as sacrilege, i.e., as an offence against the gods, the temples, the sacred, etc., and thereby invoke the system of major metaphysical pollution and build a compelling case for or against that behaviour. Similar reinterpretations are found elsewhere. Seneca the Younger, in a discussion of benefits, generosity, and gratitude, claims that a failure to show gratitude could actually be an act of sacrilege against the daughters of Jupiter.[29] Philo too, makes a similar interpretative move. He argues that murder is an act of sacrilege because it means robbing God's sanctuary of his most valuable votive offering (human beings).[30]

Both the relationship between temples and major metaphysical pollution and the flexibility with which ancient writers interpret undesirable behaviour as sacrilege are illuminating for this project. The connection between sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution reveals that threats against a temple carry with them significant danger that far exceeds the

[28] Aristotle, *Oec.* 2.2.20.

[29] Seneca, *Ben.* 1.4.5.

[30] Philo, *Decalogue* 25.133. Cf. *Spec. Laws* 3.15.83–90 in which murder is again called sacrilege and cited as a source for the creation of ἄγος. A more thorough examination of Philo and his appropriation of major metaphysical pollution is provided in the next chapter.

danger of acquiring a physical pollution. Since Paul indicates that the Corinthians endanger the temple which they are by their actions, he creates a situation in which fear of sacrilege could be reasonably invoked. The flexibility with which writers could interpret novel acts as sacrilegious means that if Paul were to reinterpret the Corinthians' behaviours as sacrilegious, this would be consistent with the practice of other ancient writers, including his fellow Jew, Philo.

2.3.2.2 – Terms for Major Metaphysical Pollution

The noun, ἄγος, and the adjective, ἐναγής, normally translated as "pollution, guilt" and "under a curse" respectively,[31] are frequently employed in the discussion of major metaphysical pollution, and they can mark a particular pollution as distinct from the more minor pollutions.[32] Ἄγος is often used to indicate the pollution that rests upon a person or place, as in Plutarch's *Life of Solon* in which the Cylonian pollution (ἄγος) persistently agitates (διαταράσσω) the city.[33] In other cases, the threat of ἄγος can serve as the sanction of a curse, as in the warning recorded by Herodotus that interfering with the warring activities of the kings can lead to ἄγος.[34] The appearance of ἐναγής can indicate that someone has been or might become "consecrated" to the deity, that is, placed in his or her avenging clutches.[35]

---

[31] See *LSJ*, s.v. ἄγος and ἐναγής.

[32] This is not unlike the use of the terms "abomination" (תועבה) and "pollute" (חנף) in the OT. These terms are used to indicate moral pollution over and against ritual pollution. See Klawans 2000, 26, and note 31. Note also that the LXX translation of these words is not completely uniform. For example, while תועבה is frequently translated as βδέλυγμα, there are instances where βδέλυγμα appears in the LXX but תועבה is absent in the Hebrew text (e.g., Lev 11:10 and throughout Lev 11). Similarly, חנף is translated using a variety of words in the LXX such as φονοκτονέω, μιαίνω, and μολύνω.

[33] Plutarch, *Sol.* 12.1.

[34] Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 6.56.

[35] Parker 1983, 9.

While the presence of ἄγος and ἐναγής can reveal the presence of major metaphysical pollution in a given text, their absence does not indicate the absence of concepts of major metaphysical pollution for two reasons. First, while ἄγος and ἐναγής are generally used of major metaphysical pollution rather than minor pollution, the reverse is not true. That is, μια- words and other pollution words can indicate major pollution, and only the context makes it clear which kind of pollution is meant. Robert Parker sums this up well when he says "every *agos* is probably also a *miasma*" but "not all *miasmata* are *agē*."[36] Second, in many texts in which the logic of major metaphysical pollution is in view, the pollution is not directly labelled at all. This is clear in the table provided below, which includes many cases in which the cause, effect, and resolution of major metaphysical pollution are all present, but where specific pollution vocabulary is absent.[37] This means the presence of ἄγος and ἐναγής can help us to identify the presence of major metaphysical pollution, but we cannot discount the presence of such pollution based on vocabulary alone.

This discussion is critical for my thesis because, while the words ἄγος and ἐναγής are not found in Paul (or in the NT more generally), it is possible that the concepts they invoke are still present. In order to determine if this is so, we will compare Paul's use of temple imagery in its contexts with the other features of major metaphysical pollution examined in this chapter and ask several questions. 1) Does Paul present the danger to the temple as sacrilege? Does his argument employ any language that is used to signal sacrilegious behaviour? 2) Do the effects of Corinthian behaviours against the temple parallel the effects that would be expected according to

[36] Parker 1983, 8. This flexibility can be seen in, for example, Aelian, who uses μίασμα in parallel to ἄγος and in reference to a single item, thus blurring the distinction in terms (see Aelian, *Nat. an.* 6.39).

[37] E.g., Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 15.49.6; Appian, *Hist. rom.* 9.2.4–6.

the logic of major metaphysical pollution, or are they tied more clearly to, for example, concerns about God's presence in the temple? 3) What are the consequences of Corinthian behaviours, and how are their crimes resolved? In my exegetical chapters, I will look for these and other clues that Paul could be interacting with these concepts.

2.3.2.3 – Effects of Major Metaphysical Pollution

Major metaphysical pollution can present danger both to the polluted person and to those associated with him or her. This danger is generally manifested physically, although the precise effect can vary. Earthquakes,[38] shipwrecks,[39] storms,[40] crop failure,[41] and plague[42] all follow on the heels of such pollution. The gods might even strike people down in a more or less indiscriminate fashion.[43] In other cases, an inability to perform efficacious rituals or an appearance of supernatural phenomena reveals the lingering impact of pollution in an afflicted community.[44] Regardless of the specifics, these effects are often tied to the polluting presence of a person who is ἐναγής, and they often last until the pollution is resolved through judgement against that guilty person. This judgement will be discussed more thoroughly in the next section.

[38] Herodotus, *Persian Wars.* 5.85; Thucydides, *Hist.* 1.128; Diodorus Siculus, *Library* 15.49.6; Appian, *Hist. rom.* 9.2.4–6.

[39] Euripides, *El*. 1350.

[40] Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 5.85; Aelian, *Var. hist.* 8.5.

[41] Plutarch, *Rom.* 23.1–24.3; Pausanias, *Descr.* 7.19.3–6.

[42] Sophocles, *OT* 1425; Pseudo-Plutarch, [*Par. Min.* 310 C].

[43] This is the case in, for example, Pausanias, *Descr.* 7.19.3–6. Here, although only two people committed sacrilege by having sex in the temple of Artemis, we are told that the wrath of Artemis began to destroy the inhabitants of the city (labelled here as τοὺς ἀνθρώπους).

[44] Plutarch, *Sol.* 12.1–6.

The first significant difference between the OT system of ritual/moral pollution and major metaphysical pollution is seen here in the effects of pollution. The OT evidences a serious concern that pollution will lead to the loss of God's presence. Ritual pollution that is brought into contact with the sacred can cut someone off from the community and from God. Lev 22:3 says, "If anyone among all your offspring throughout your generations comes near the sacred donations, which the people of Israel dedicate to the Lord, while he is in a state of uncleanness, that person shall be cut off from my presence." Moral pollution created by heinous crime pollutes not only the guilty person, but also the land and the sanctuary/temple.[45] This pollution of the land and temple is problematic because it threatens the very presence of God with his people. Over time, such accumulated pollution could drive God's presence from Israel[46] and this situtation would then resolve with Israel itself driven into exile.[47] To be sure, the loss of God's presence in the temple in response to moral pollution does not occur regularly. However, while the actual loss of the Shekinah and ensuing destruction of the temple is rare, the *concern* that accumulated moral pollution will lead to the loss of God's presence generally and to the destruction of the temple and exile more specifically, is common in the OT. This interest in the

[45] A detailed discussion of the pollution and purification of the sanctuary is found in Milgrom 1976. See also Num 35:30–34; Jer 2:7, 3:1; Ezek 36:18; and Pss 106:36–40 for the pollution of the land.

[46] As Milgrom 1976, 396, summarises: "Why the urgency to purge the sanctuary? The answer lies in the postulate: the God to Israel will not abide in a polluted sanctuary." See texts such as Ezek 8–11, esp. 11:22–3, which speaks of the loss of God's presence in the temple: "Then the cherubim lifted up their wings, with the wheels beside them; and the glory of the God of Israel was above them. And the glory of the Lord ascended from the middle of the city, and stopped on the mountain east of the city." See Thiessen 2020, chap. 1 for a recent rehabilitation of this discussion.

Fears concerning the loss of God's presence following polluting sins (e.g., idolatry, bloodshed, sexual sin) are found in numerous other passages. In Pss 51, the Psalmist fears being cast from the Lord because of his sins. In Hos 5:6, following a charge of Israel's prostitution and bloodshed, it is warned: "With their flocks and hers they shall go to seek the LORD, but they will not find him; he has withdrawn from them." In Deut 31:17–18, the Lord tells Moses that he will forsake Israel and depart from it because it will participate in idolatry.

[47] E.g., Deut 28:64: "The Lord will scatter you among all peoples, from one end of the earth to the other; and there you shall serve other gods, of wood and stone, which neither you nor your ancestors have known."

maintenance of God's presence is tied to a particular notion of God's covenant with Israel that drives much of the OT narrative, but such a concept of covenant is alien to the pagan sources surveyed in this chapter. So, in what ways do these texts resonate with or else deviate from the narrative of accumulating pollution and divine absence in the OT?

At the broadest level, belief that gods can leave their temples is well attested across the ancient world,[48] and the loss of the gods' presence is often associated with danger.[49] Several texts speak to divine absence caused by the neglect of the temples,[50] by the improper observance of ritual norms,[51] or even by the gods leaving their temples for a better home,[52] and some of these causes, notably improper rituals and neglect of temples, do seem to represent sacrilegious offences against the gods. Despite the shared belief that the gods *can* leave their temples, however, there is no over-arching narrative across ancient literature outside the OT that sees the accumulation of pollution from idolatry, sex, and bloodshed as the root cause of every instance of the loss of the gods from their temples. Indeed, Parker affirms, "the idea, found in some mythologies, of divine power waning beneath clogging pollution is not attested in Greece."[53]

---

[48] So Jackson 2018, 85, is correct when he says, "within antiquity in general, as in the Jewish and Christian sources, there was a recognition of the potential for divine absence from temples" (cf. Jiménez 2018, 492–93, who refers to a "universal fear of divine desertion").

[49] See, for example, Virgil, *Aen.* 2.351: "All the gods on whom this empire was stayed have gone forth, leaving shrine and altar; the city you aid is in flames" [Rushton].

[50] So Horace, *Odes* 3.6.1. "Though guiltless, you will continue to pay for the sins of your forefathers, Roman, until you repair the crumbling temples and shrines of the gods . . . Because they have been neglected, the gods have inflicted many a woe on sorrowing Westland."

[51] So Livy, *History of Rome*, 4.1.8–9, who tied proper ritual with the gods' support when he says that some act "as though we had no further use for Heaven's favour," and "are polluting all the ceremonies."

[52] Several texts testify to the Roman practice of *evocatio*, whereby the Romans would call the gods of opposing nations out of their temples and invite them to Rome. See Livy, *History of Rome* 5.22.33–7; Pliny *Nat.* 28.18–19.

[53] Parker 1983, 145.

In *some* instances sacrilege or impiety is connected to the loss of the gods, but in many other instances of sacrilege the god's presence seems hardly at stake.[54] Moreover, the gods can leave their temples in response to a variety of factors, and the loss of the gods' presence does not even always indicate the anger of the gods. In Plutarch's narrative of Themistocles, for example, the sudden disappearance of a sacred serpent from the Athenian Acropolis was not taken as a sign of the Athenian's accumulated pollution, but as a sign that "the goddess had abandoned her city and was showing them their way to the sea."[55] This led them to flee the city and fight the Persians at sea just as Themistocles had urged them to do. Instead of a constant concern that accumulated pollution will drive away the gods (per the OT), the most common threat of major metaphysical pollution is the physical danger created by the presence of a polluted person in the midst of a community.

This distinction between the effects of pollution in the OT and the effects associated with major metaphysical pollution is critical because assuming one background or another for Paul's imagery can affect the way one interprets the impact of the Corinthians' temple-threatening behaviour. Many scholars who compare Paul with Old Testament texts (without close comparison with other literature) think, rather naturally, that Corinthian sin will drive away God's presence, that is, the Holy Spirit who indwells in the community.[56] These claims are often

[54] Numerous texts collected in "Table 1" below connect sacrilege to pollution and judgement, but without any hint that the gods will abandon their temples because of the sacrilege.

[55] Plutarch, *Them.* 10.1–3.

[56] Robertson and Plummer 1950, 66, say that "by giving rein to the flesh . . . [the Corinthians] tend to banish the Holy Spirit, and so to destroy the Temple constituted by His presence." Such interpretations remain common in more recent work. For example, Wassen 2013, 78, believes the Corinthians "must now preserve their purity by living righteously, in order that God's presence may remain within the community." Cf. Donfried 1976, 108–9; Newton 1985, 59; Fee 1994, 11; all of whom think that polluting the temple that is the body and/or community threatens the presence of the Spirit.

It is important to note that the "Holy Spirit" (τὸ πνεῦμά with ἅγιον) never indwells the temple in the OT, although it can symbolise God's presence in Israel in e.g., Isa 63:11 and Pss 50:13 LXX. Regev 2019, 58, suggests

made, however, without close examination of the Pauline texts themselves, and seem to depend primarily on discussions of sin and pollution and their relation to the temple in the OT. If it can be shown that Paul does not expect the loss of God's Spirit in the church but rather a different consequence for Corinthian behaviour (such as more immediate and physical judgement), then it may be that his use of temple imagery resonates with concepts of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution more than is usually accepted.

2.3.2.4 – Resolution of Major Metaphysical Pollution

So, how are major metaphysical pollution and the problems it brings normally dealt with? Major metaphysical pollution is generally resolved by an act of judgement from the gods directed specifically against the one who incurs the pollution. This judgement is frequently depicted as unavoidable and inevitable. As Parker notes, the one who is ἐναγής is firmly "in the grip of an avenging power."[57] Judgement is usually constituted by physical affliction or death.[58] Whatever other negative effects (if any) were caused by the pollution will tend to end with the execution of judgement against the particular guilty person or persons.

Sometimes judgement is inflicted by human hands rather than the direct intervention of the gods, but this is still seen as judgement from the gods and it does not reduce the perceived inevitability of judgement that follows offences against the gods. In Diodorus Siculus's account of the Sacred War, Philomelus, a temple robber, throws himself from a cliff. Although the gods do not directly cause his death, it is still interpreted as a punishment from gods and men (ὑπὸ

---

that, "the basic concept that God's *spirit* (and not merely His dwelling or presence) resides in the Temple is Paul's innovation."

[57] Parker 1983, 9.

[58] E.g., destruction by fire from heaven appears in Pausanias, *Descr.* 9.25.10–9.26.1 and destruction by consumption appears in Appian, *Hist. rom.* 11.66.

θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων κεκολασμένον)[59] and is said to resolve the pollution by giving justice to the god (δοὺς τῷ δαιμονίῳ δίκας).[60] Similarly, in Aeschines' *Against Ctesiphon*, we see punishment from humans as a means by which the gods exact judgement. Here, the Pythia tells the Amphictyons that they must act to destroy the sacrilegious Cirrhaeans and the Cragalidae and then dedicate their land to the gods.[61] In this narrative, the destruction of the guilty by human beings is seen as an aid to the gods and it is this destruction that purifies (ἀφοσιόω) the polluted city.[62] Regardless of the actor through whom judgement is delivered, the need for judgement as resolution remains constant in these texts.

Sometimes judgement against the polluted person is delayed, but many authors ensure that this delay does not diminish the certainty with which it will eventually occur. In Plutarch's *Life of Timoleon,* several mercenaries commit sacrilege against the temple at Delphi, but suffer no immediate consequences.[63] Lest the reader lose faith in the sureness of their punishment, however, Plutarch notes that when the men are sent away on other missions, Justice (Δίκη) destroys them.[64] Plutarch then explains that the delay in their judgement is tied to the gods' good will towards Timoleon (πρὸς Τιμολέοντα τῶν θεῶν εὐμένειαν)[65] and Justice's desire to maintain

[59] Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 16.32.1.

[60] Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 16.31.5.

[61] Aeschines, *Ctes.* 3.108.

[62] Aeschines, *Ctes.* 3.120.

[63] Plutarch, *Tim.* 30.7–10.

[64] The logic of this story closely follows the logic adopted by the people of Malta in Acts 28. There, Paul survives a shipwreck, but is then bitten by a snake. The natives say, "This man must be a murderer; though he has escaped from the sea, justice (δίκη) has not allowed him to live" (Acts 28:4). As in Plutarch's story, there is an assumption that Δίκη will pursue the unjust until their judgement is realised.

[65] Plutarch, *Tim.* 30.10.

his good fortune. Thomas Harrison points out similar passages from Herodotus.[66] In one story, the Pythia reveals that misfortunes Croesus has experienced are actually due retribution for the heinous bloodshed committed not by him, but rather by his ancestor.[67] Thus, judgement ultimately occurs generations after the initial offence. The way that these texts connect serious offences to misfortunes that occur much later underscores the way these writers view judgement for serious crimes as inevitable.[68]

Sometimes a story concludes with expulsion rather than destruction for the polluted person, but this expulsion seems to take place to protect the community from the harmful effects of the pollution, not to save the guilty from judgement. In Plutarch's *Life of Solon*, those guilty of murdering suppliants at the temple are expelled, but this takes place to restore the purity of the city. No concern whatsoever is indicated for the well-being of those expelled.[69] Similarly, in one passage from Thucydides, Athenians who killed people seeking sanctuary at a temple are called accursed (ἐναγεῖς) and driven out, but there is no indication that the act of expulsion removes the curse from the Athenians. These instances of expulsion do not, then, take away from the point I am highlighting here, namely, that judgement is a usual means by which major metaphysical pollution is resolved.

Finally, many texts make it explicit that major metaphysical pollution cannot be removed by any means of purification or appeal to the gods whatsoever, and that judgement is therefore

---

[66] T. Harrison 1997, 107–10, suggests that the possibility of delay is one way in which the Greeks could maintain belief in divine retribution despite real-world instances in which people apparently avoid punishment for their crimes.

[67] Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 1.91.

[68] Indeed, this is exactly the point the Pythia makes when talking about Croesus. In her words: "None may escape his destined lot, not even a god" (Τὴν πεπρωμένην μοῖραν ἀδύνατα ἐστὶ ἀποφυγεῖν καὶ θεῷ) (Herodotus 1.91 [Godley]).

[69] Plutarch, *Sol.* 12.1–6. Similarly, Sophocles, *OT* 1426–1528.

certain. For example, Pausanias (the geographer) notes that Pausanias (the Spartan general) can remove the ἄγος that afflicts him through any act of purification (called καθάρσια), although he tries to do so.[70] He ultimately has to pay the penalty for his actions.[71] Similarly, although dragging a suppliant from a temple normally qualifies as sacrilege, both Diodorus Siculus and Philo argue that those seeking sanctuary in a temple can be rightly removed and killed when they are guilty of offences against the gods.[72] These texts highlight a certainty with which judgement follows on the heels of offences against the gods, and an impossibility of escape either through acts of purification or through appeal to the gods as a suppliant.

The resolution of major metaphysical pollution by judgement is distinct from some important OT discussions of moral pollution and sin in three key ways. First, the scope of judgement differs. In the OT, moral pollution *can* lead to punishment for an individual,[73] but a major concern is that accumulated pollution will lead to judgement through exile for all Israel.[74] In other ancient literature, pollution is more often resolved when the polluted person, that is, the one who commited the act of polluting sacrilege, experiences judgement.[75] It is of course possible for a polluted person to create danger for others, but two points are worth noting here. Initially, in many texts that include communal danger, the judgement is not actually directed at

[70] Pausanias, *Descr.* 3.17.9.

[71] The nature of the penalty is somewhat unclear in this case.

[72] Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 16.56–58; Philo, *Confusion* 31.161.

[73] For example, the penalty prescribed for idolatry in Ex 22:20 is death for the guilty. There are also texts such as 2 Sam 6:6–7 that speak to the sense of immediate danger that holy things present to those who violate their sanctity.

[74] So Lev 18:24–30.

[75] So Suh 2020, 152, claims, "if a person committed transgression within a sacred space [in Greco-Roman literature], then the punishment will be meted out to that specific offender." While his claim is not fully nuanced to account for the kinds of communal danger created by pollution, Suh picks up here on the frequency with which serious offences against temples lead to swift judgement directed precisely against the guilty person.

the wider community, nor is the pollution resolved by harming members of the community. Instead, the presence of the polluted person creates a danger that disappears with the judgement of the guilty individual.[76] In addition, although exile is one possible result of major metaphysical pollution in, it is frequently the exile only of the guilty person(s), who may still face judgement from the gods once he or she is expelled. There is no general pattern of corporate exile following serious pollution. This deviates from the discussions of moral pollution and exile in the OT significantly.

Second, the relationship between judgement and the temple differs. In the OT, one pollutes the temple through sin and, once it accumulates, judgement on Israel can include judgement on the polluted temple. This is seen in texts such as Jer 26:4–6, in which the prophet stands in the house of the Lord and warns: "Thus says the Lord: If you will not listen to me, to walk in my law that I have set before you, and to heed the words of my servants the prophets whom I send to you urgently—though you have not heeded—then I will make this house like Shiloh, and I will make this city a curse for all the nations of the earth."[77] Here, one aspect of the judgement against the Israelites, who have participated in acts such as idolatry that create moral pollution, is the destruction of the temple itself. In other ancient literature, the loss of the gods in a temple, which I already pointed out is not necessarily tied to sacrilege or accumulated

[76] The example from Pseudo-Plutarch, [*Par. Min.* 310 C], illustrates this well. A plague afflicts the Syracusans as the result of a case of incest in their midst, but while the plague harms them all, their suffering does not resolve the pollution. This is done only by sacrificing the guilty person. Presumably, if the guilty person had been sacrificed sooner, fewer other people would have suffered.

There is a concept of vengeance against a community for one man's injustice in Hesiod, *Op.* 261, but it is important to note that the one, unjust man is also a king. As Petrovic and Petrovic 2016, 179, note in their discussion of Sophocles, *Ant.*, when someone is a king "his thoughts and actions towards the gods thus bear more weight."

[77] Cf. the warning in 1 Kings 9:8 ("This house will become a heap of ruins; everyone passing by it will be astonished, and will hiss; and they will say, 'Why has the Lord done such a thing to this land and to this house?'") and Ezra 5:12 ("But because our ancestors had angered the God of heaven, he gave them into the hand of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, the Chaldean, who destroyed this house and carried away the people to Babylonia").

pollution, *can* mean the destruction of that temple, but this does not guarantee that judgement is being brought against a polluted temple.[78] More often, people incur major metaphysical pollution by polluting, damaging, or destroying a temple, and they are then struck down in response as an act of judgement, but the afflicted temple is not also the object of judgement.

Third, judgement is not necessarily inevitable following moral pollution in the OT because there are means by which one can remove the pollution apart from judgement. In particular, the Day of Atonement in Lev 16 provides a mechanism both for the purification of the polluted temple and for the removal of communal sin. Lev 16:33 says, "He shall make atonement for the sanctuary, and he shall make atonement for the tent of meeting and for the altar, and he shall make atonement for the priests and for all the people of the assembly." This atonement includes cleansing from all sins such that Israel is pure before the Lord. Such a universal ritual of purification from serious temple pollution and guilt is absent from other texts.[79] Instead, these other ancient writers tend to stress the impossibility of escaping judgement.

The ways in which major metaphysical pollution is resolved is critical for this thesis because Paul suggests that the Corinthians can harm the temple through their actions. In order to determine whether Paul follows the logic of major metaphysical pollution, we should ask several questions about how Paul uses the temple in 1 Corinthians. In particular, we should consider *whether* Paul implies some sort of judgement in response to harming the temple, *what kind of*

[78] See, for example, the story of the sacred snake that abandons the temple in Plutarch, *Them.* 10.1–3 (referenced above) and the parallel account in Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 8.41.

[79] Nor does the expulsion of the *pharmakos* in Greek texts function in the same way as the expulsion of the scapegoat in the OT. Parker 1983, 259, notes, "the *pharmakos* ceases to be a mere vehicle on to which, like the original scapegoat of the Old Testament, the ills of the community are loaded by a mechanical process of transference, and becomes instead, through his crime, the actual cause of whatever affliction is being suffered."

judgement seems to be implied, *against whom* it is directed, and *how* or *if* judgement is avoidable.

2.3.3 – Summary of Major Metaphysical Pollution

All kinds of crimes against the gods and especially sacrilege and temple desecration create major metaphysical pollution. These pollutions are often labelled with ἄγος and ἐναγής. These pollutions cause a variety of negative effects that can harm entire communities. They are frequently resolved by the gods through judgement. This judgement can take place either by the direct intervention of the gods themselves, or else by human beings acting on their behalf. This judgement is often depicted as something physical, unavoidable, and inevitable. The table below outlines a number of relevant texts for easy comparison, presented in chronological order by author.

Table 1 –Major Metaphysical Pollution in Ancient Literature

Source	Cause	Terms	Effect	Resolution
Aeschylus *Pers.* 805–26	Destroying temples and harming images of gods	Not labelled	Not described	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Sophocles *OT* 95–101	Bloodshed	μίασμα	Storm	Expulsion of the guilty or destruction of the guilty by humans
OT 1426	Patricide and incest	ἄγος	Plague	Expulsion of the guilty
Herodotus		Not labelled		

Persian Wars 5.85	Harming images of gods		Earthquakes, storms, madness	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Persian Wars 6.56	Interfering with activities of the kings	ἄγος	None described	None described
Persian Wars 8.144	Destroying temples	Not labelled	None described	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Thucydides *Hist.* 1.126	Murdering suppliants at temple	ἄγος and ἐναγής	A curse on the guilty and their descendants	Expulsion of the guilty
Hist. 1.128	Murdering suppliants at temple	ἄγος	Earthquake	Expulsion of the curse
Demosthenes *Timocr*. 24.121	Harming images of gods	Not labelled	None described	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Aristotle *Oec.* 2.2.20	Failure to bring jewellery to temple (called ἱεροσυλίας)	Not labelled	A visitation of the goddess's anger	None described
Euripides *Phoen.* 1045–1050	Incest	μιαίνω	Pollution of the city	None described
El. 1350	Oath-breaking	Not labelled	Shipwreck	Destruction of the guilty by gods
Aeschines *Ctes.* 3.105–122	Impiety against temple	ἐναγής	Fractured relationship with the gods, restricted access to temples	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Diodorus Siculus *Library of History* 15.49.6	Sacrilege against offerings	Not labelled	Earthquakes, floods	Destruction of the guilty by the gods

Library of History 16.28.1–4	Temple robbery	Not labelled	None described	Destruction of the guilty by human hands
Library of History 16.30.1–16.31.5	Plundering the oracle (συλᾶν τὸ μαντεῖον) at Delphi	Not labelled	None described	Destruction of the guilty by human hands
Library of History 16.56.1–16.58.6	Temple robbery	Not labelled	None described	Destruction of the guilty by humans or the gods
Strabo *Geogr*. 8.3.33	Invading (or failing to protect from invasion) a land sacred to Zeus	ἐναγής	None described	None described
Plutarch *Tim.* 30.7–10	Sacrilege against temple	ἐπάρατος	None described	Destruction of the guilty by the gods
Sol. 12.1–6	Murdering suppliants at temple	ἄγος	Supernatural disturbances (φάσμα)	Expulsion of the guilty; purification of the city
Her. Mal. 20 B	Removing a suppliant from a temple	ἄγος	None described	None described
Rom. 23.1–24.3	Murdering someone offering sacrifices	μήνιμα δαιμόνιον	Plague, death, barren land, rain of blood	Destruction of the guilty by humans, purification of the city
Pseudo-Plutarch [*Par. Min.* 310 C]	Incest	Not labelled	Plague	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Vit. X orat. 834 C–E	Sacrilege	Not labelled	None Described	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Appian *Bell. civ.* 3.15.55	Bloodshed	ἄγος	None described	None described

Hist. rom. 8.1.127–133	Sacrilege	Not labelled	None described	Exclusion from share in plunder
Hist. rom. 9.2.4–6	Assault on a temple	Not labelled	Storms, plague of frogs, earthquakes	Destruction of the guilty by the gods
Hist. rom. 11.66	Temple robbery	Not labelled	None described	Destruction of the guilty by the gods
Pausanias *Descr.* 3.17.8–9	Bloodshed	ἄγος	Restricted access to temples, inability to be purified	Destruction of the guilty by the gods
Descr. 7.19.3–6	Sex in temple	Not labelled	Artemis strikes many people, crops fail, disease	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Descr. 9.25.10–9.26.1	Entering a holy temple	Not labelled	None described	Destruction of the guilty by the gods
Dio Cassius *Roman History* 51.8.3	Cutting tress from sacred grove	Not labelled	None described except the need to make amends to the gods	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Aelian *Nat. an.* 6.39	Incest	ἄγος and μίασμα	None described	None described
Var. hist. 8.5	Unclear	οὐ καθαρῶν τὰς χεῖρας	Storms	Not described

This table reveals the variety of ways in which ancient writers deal with major metaphysical pollution, while also highlighting commonalities that bind them. Most prominently, any act interpreted as sacrilege can prove dangerous, particularly for the offender, but possibly also for

those around him or her. Almost invariably, such acts lead to physical judgement. The basic framework of metaphysical pollution is presented below, with the critical elements for this thesis highlighted:

Table 2 – Summary of Major Metaphysical Pollution

Cause	Terms	Effect	Resolution
Offence against the gods such as sacrilege, certain kinds of bloodshed, sexual deviance Or An act *interpreted as sacrilege*, that is, interpreted as against the gods, temples, or other sacred things.	The words ἄγος and ἐναγής can refer to major metaphysical pollution, but their absence does not mean the absence of the concept.	Physical danger, often with the potential to affect those in close proximity to the guilty, but not necessarily the loss of the gods' presence in the land or temple.	Usually resolved by physical judgement, and frequently depicted as inexpiable apart from that judgement.

2.3.4 – Conclusion

In this section I have outlined a system of pollution, the shape of which is found repeatedly in ancient literature representing a variety of places, genres, and eras of the Greco-Roman world, and which lies behind many discussions of sacrilege and judgement. I noted the differences between physical and minor metaphysical pollution on the one hand, and major metaphysical pollution on the other. I emphasised the close connection between offences against temples and the acquisition of major pollution, and noted that writers could interpret novel acts as sacrilegious. I examined key terminology and concluded that the absence of certain pollution words does not always mean the absence of major pollution as a concept. I highlighted differences between the effects of major metaphyical pollution and the effects of moral pollution described in OT texts, and emphasised the favouring of physical judgement as the means by

which major pollution is resolved. I discussed throughout how one could determine whether Paul draws on major metaphysical pollution or on OT discussions of temple pollution.

These data provide the background for a study of Paul in light of concepts of temple sacrilege by outlining the system of pollution on which these concepts depend. The question remains, however, whether Jews in the first century would appeal to this system of pollution in a discussion of temples when there was a comprehensive system of temple purity and pollution already outlined in the OT, and if so, why? In the next chapter I will answer this question by examining two first-century Jewish writers: Josephus and Philo. I will consider whether and how these writers employ the language and logic of major metaphysical pollution, and towards what purposes. This anlysis will enable us better to nuance the relationship between what we call "Jewish" and what we call "Greco-Roman" in the first century and reveal whether we are justified in assuming disjunction between these in regards to temple sacrilege. What is more, this will show us whether it is historically plausible for Paul, another first-century Jew, to appropriate concepts of major metaphysical pollution in his discussions and applications of temple imagery. Placing Josephus and Philo in conversation with Paul also gives us material with which we can clarify how and, perhaps more importantly, why, Paul might use major metaphysical pollution.

CHAPTER 3 –POLLUTION, THE TEMPLE, AND FIRST–CENTURY JEWISH WRITERS

3.1 – Introduction

In the previous chapter I considered the system of major metaphysical pollution that lies beneath discussions of sacrilege, noting the rules by which it operates, how it differs from discussions of moral and ritual pollution in the OT, and how we could know whether Paul draws on this system. One significant obstacle to an analysis of Paul alongside major metaphysical pollution is the question of whether a first-century Jew who opposes idolatry and leans on the OT would adopt a pollution system found ubiquitously in texts written by pagans. Is it likely that Paul would draw on these concepts of pollution when the OT delineates a system of temple pollution and its consequences that is distinct in some ways? Many scholars would likely answer this question with a resounding, "No!" because they would distance pagan concepts from Paul's understanding of the temple.

To take a recent example, Eyal Regev asks whether Paul would draw on pagan conceptions of temples and answers by saying: "The last thing he [Paul] wants to do is to stimulate their [the Corinthians] spiritual imagination and self-understanding with images of local pagan cults and sanctuaries."[1] Further, he adds: "The fact that they [the Corinthians] are already familiar with other Greek (pagan) cults is hardly helpful."[2] Jay Shanor provides a

[1] Regev 2019, 67. I should note, however, that asking whether Paul would willingly "stimulate" the Corinthians to see themselves as a pagan temple is a different question from asking whether Paul might draw from some concepts of temples that pagans also utilised.

[2] Regev 2019, 67.

detailed analysis of Greek temple building contracts, highlights similarities in language between those contracts and 1 Cor 3:9–17, and concludes that the Greek language of temple construction provided the material for Paul's temple metaphor,[3] but Albert Hogeterp disagrees with this conclusion, saying Paul would not have used pagan material to construct his metaphorical image. He states, "Shanor's viewpoint appears very unlikely to me, for Paul's view about pagan temples is negative, as his pejorative reference to an 'idol's temple,' εἰδωλείον, in 1 Cor 8:10 indicates."[4] Nijay Gupta, in his review of Vahrenhorst's *Kultische Sprache*,[5] questions whether Paul's cultic images "are powerful precisely because they exist as a point of commonality between Jews and non-Jews" and finds the idea that "Paul purposefully employed non-Jewish cultic terminology" to be tenuous.[6]

The reaction against Paul's use of concepts deemed "pagan" illustrates a trend noted in my history of interpretation: Pauline scholars frequently dichotomise Jewish and Greco-Roman material in a way that leads to the near exclusion of non-Jewish material from consideration. We must acknowledge, however, that first-century Judaism was Hellenised in various ways.[7] So,

---

[3] Shanor 1988. Shared vocabulary includes terms such as ἔργον, ζημιόω, and φθείρω.

[4] Hogeterp 2006, 320. Hogeterp's critique is an odd one, and it illustrates just how strongly some scholars have resisted the idea that Paul's temple imagery is coherent with discussions of temples in pagan sources. Shanor does not argue that Paul's temple imagery incorporates elements of pagan theology. Instead, he only seeks to demonstrate that the kind of language Paul uses in 1 Cor 3:9b–17 bears many similarities to the language of construction in some Greek temple-building *construction contracts*. Importantly, these contracts do not speak to the cultic significance of the temple, and Shanor explicitly states: "To intimate any direct connection between these two ancient sources [the inscription he examines and 1 Corinthians] is out of the question, and perhaps even to imply that Paul had any other *specific* inscription in mind unlikely [*sic.*]" (Shanor 1988, 471). It seems to me that Paul could quite naturally use construction language common to his era whether he approved of all the things being built or not.

[5] Vahrenhorst 2008.

[6] Gupta 2010, 24.

[7] A detailed examination of Jewish interaction with the Hellenised world lies well beyond the scope of this project. However, for an analysis of second-temple Judaism, see N.T. Wright 1992, pt. 3; 2013a, chap. 2. For a study of diaspora Jews, see Barclay 1996. For Jewish society in relation to foreign empires, see Schwartz 2001.

rather than denying at the outset that major metaphysical pollution is relevant for Paul on account of its attestation in texts by pagan authors, we would do better to consider the practices of Jewish writers in the first century.

In this chapter, I will explore the use of major metaphysical pollution in Josephus and Philo. I will break this chapter into two sections, each dealing with one of these writers. I will conduct my analysis by locating places in their writings that could potentially demonstrate the logic of major metaphysical pollution, that is, by locating places where sacrilege, bloodshed, and sexual deviance are labelled as pollutants and/or tied to judgement. Many of these texts use the technical vocabulary of major metaphysical pollution (ἅγος and ἐναγής), but not all of them do. As noted before, the absence of the words ἅγος and ἐναγής does not also prove the absence of major metaphysical pollution, so even in those texts that lack these words we can consider whether a pattern of thinking common to other ancient literature is present. In addition to noting if Josephus and Philo use major metaphysical pollution, I will also ask how they use it and whether there is any common pattern to their usage.[8]

This analysis will prove relevant for my exegesis of 1 Corinthians for reasons. First, it will clarify some aspects of the the Jewish/Greco-Roman relationship, at least as it relates to the issues of sacrilege, pollution, and judgement. It will expose whether Jews in the first century demonstrate a pattern of thinking common in the broader Greco-Roman world and illuminate whether we should suppose a disjunction between Jewish and Greco-Roman approaches to sacrilege. Second, it will establish whether it is historically plausible for a first-century Jew, like Paul, to draw on major metaphysical pollution while maintaining his commitment to Judaism and

[8] Not every passage provides sufficient data for me to make claims about the meaning and use of major metaphysical pollution. For example, although ἅγος appears in Philo, *Drunkenness* 66–67, the context does little to clarify its significance other except to reveal that priests are meant to avoid it.

his critique of pagan cultic practices. It will also reveal whether it is likely that Paul would draw on such concepts in relation to the image of a temple. Third, considering how Josephus and Philo use major metaphysical pollution can help us clarify both *how* Paul might also use it in 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 and *why* he would use it in these two passages instead of crafting an argument that relies more exclusively on the discussions of temple and pollution in the OT.

3.2 – Major Metaphysical Pollution in Josephus

Josephus's writings provide valuable evidence for the interaction between Jewish and Greco-Roman cultures in the first century. On the one hand, Josephus writes for a Greco-Roman audience.[9] While the precise extent to which Josephus's work demonstrates either Roman or Jewish sympathies is debatable,[10] there are certainly elements of his work that are ostensibly pro-Roman.[11] On the other hand, even as he writes for a Greek-speaking, Gentile audience, he emphasises, in Jewish fashion, his descent from a priestly line and his experience with Jewish religious sects.[12] He interacts extensively with Jewish history and the OT and produces important apologetic writings for the Jews.[13] He also explicitly distances himself from the Greeks in

[9] This is not to deny that Josephus may have also intended Jews to read his works. Josephus himself lists both Jews and Gentiles among those who received copies of his work in *Apion* 1.50–51. For discussion of Jewish readership see Klawans 2012, 4; Ehrenkrook 2011, 13–16; Olson 2010, 40–49; and Brighton 2009, 43–47.

[10] Thackeray 1967, for example, is inclined to see the *Jewish Wars* as Roman propaganda. Mason 2016a, 97, argues for an intermediate view of Josephus as someone who was known to the Roman family, but who was not necessarily a "Minister of Propaganda."

[11] See esp. Josephus, *J.W.* 4.184–185, in which Ananus says: "It is the Romans who may well be found to have been the upholders of our laws" and *J.W.* 5.363–364, in which Josephus (a character in the narrative) says "The Romans . . . though without a share in them, yet reverenced the holy places of their enemies, and had thus far restrained their hands from them; whereas men who had been brought up in them and, were they preserved, would alone enjoy them, were bent on their destruction" [Thackeray].

[12] Josephus, *Life*, 1.1–12: "My family is no ignoble one, tracing its descent far back to priestly ancestors. Different races base their claim to nobility on various grounds; with us a connexion with the priesthood is the hallmark of an illustrious line" [Thackery]. Not only does Josephus appeal to his ancestry in a manner common among Jews, but he explicitly identifies it as such. Cf. Paul in Phil 3:5, in which he also stresses his ancestry.

[13] Namely, *Antiquities* and *Against Apion*.

several texts.[14] Josephus sits at an intersection between Jewish and Greco-Roman cultures. It is therefore constructive to ask how one who self-consciously identifies as Jewish might use the logic of major metaphysical pollution.

My treatment of Josephus will proceed in three steps. I will first consider his use of major metaphysical pollution in his description of the temple's destruction in *Jewish War*, and highlight how he uses logics of sacrilege and judgement to explain why the temple was destroyed. I will then examine two texts in which he retells narratives from the OT and note how Josephus uses major metaphysical pollution to clarify precisely why certain crimes lead to judgement and why the judgements take the form that they do. I will conclude with a text in which he reinterprets violence against one's own people as sacrilege, and in so doing builds a powerful case against such behaviour.

3.2.1 – Pollution and Judgement and the Jerusalem Temple

Many scholars rightly note the connections between Josephus's account of the temple's destruction and the OT. Tessa Rajak says, "when pollution of the sanctuary is the climactic offence, the cries of Ezekiel against the vile abominations practiced there in earlier days are clearly evoked."[15] Similarly, Hogeterp declares, "Josephus also refers to the 'writings of the ancient prophets' as an oracle on the bad fate of Jerusalem and its Temple."[16] Many scholars also note the importance of pollution language in Josephus's narrative. For example, Walter Jackson says, "Because of the impurity of Israel God had moved away from the people and taken the side

[14] He goes so far as to censure the erudite Greeks both for their lacking literary prowess and their poor judgement in Josephus, *J.W.* 1.13–14. See also *Ant.* 1.121 and *Ag. Ap.* 1.6.

[15] Rajak 2002, 95.

[16] Hogeterp 2006, 123.

of the Romans."[17] It is less often noted that Josephus also incorporates elements of major metaphysical pollution into his account in a creative blending of two systems of pollution and judgement.[18]

Throughout his narrative, Josephus repeatedly highlights that a chief problem with the behaviour of the brigands is that it pollutes the holy temple.[19] He mentions the bloodstained hands and polluted feet (μεμιασμένοις τοῖς ποσὶ) of the brigands,[20] the polluting effect of dying in the temple and staining the sacred with blood (αἷμα μιᾶναι τὰ ἅγια),[21] and even the cessation of sacrifices and the associated pollution of the Holy Place (μιαίνειν τὸ ἅγιον).[22] Ananus also bemoans the pollution of the temple, saying: "Truly well had it been for me to have died ere I had seen the house of God laden with such abominations [ἄγεσι] and its unapproachable and hallowed places crowded with the feet of murderers!"[23]

Josephus then refers precisely to this pollution as the cause of God's wrath, thus relying on the general association between sacrilege, pollution, and judgement in ancient literature to account for the specific judgement of the temple. This connection is made clear in two critical

[17] Jackson 2018, 82. He cites, appropriately, *J.W.* 5.411–12, and *Ant.* 20.164–66.

[18] For a scholar who does consider these elements of Josephus's pollution language, see Mason 2013; cf. 2016b, 30.

[19] The weight Josephus places on the pollution of the temple is evidenced by the sheer volume of pollution language in this narrative. Ben Zvi 2013, 189–90, notes that Josephus uses the word μίασμα, along with its compounds and cognates (e.g., μιαίνω, μιαρός, μιαιφονέω, μιαιφόνος) 36 times in *J.W.*, alone, out of only 78 occurrences in all of Josephus's corpus.

[20] Josephus, *J.W.* 4.150. Cf. *J.W.* 4.242–3: "Brigands of such rank impiety as to pollute even that hallowed ground, they may be seen now recklessly intoxicating themselves in the sanctuary and expending the spoils of their slaughtered victims upon their insatiable bellies" [Thackeray].

[21] Josephus, *J.W.* 4.202; cf. *J.W.* 5.7–10; 5.17–20.

[22] Josephus, *J.W.* 6.93–103.

[23] Josephus, *J.W.* 4.163 [Thackeray].

texts. In book 4, Josephus suggests, "I suppose, because God had, for its pollutions [μεμιασμένης], condemned the city to destruction and desired to purge the sanctuary by fire, that He thus cut off those who clung to them with such tender affection."[24] In book 6, Josephus (the character in the narrative) explains, "God it is then, God Himself, who with the Romans is bringing the fire to purge His temple and exterminating a city so laden with pollutions [μιασμάτων γέμουσαν]."[25] Although neither of these two texts uses the particular vocabulary of major metaphysical pollution (ἅγος and ἐναγής), Josephus links polluting sacrilege and destructive judgement in a way that is consistent with the logic of this system in the sense that sacrilege leads to destruction for the guilty and danger for all those around them.

Noting these points of resonance between Josephus and the system of major metaphysical pollution does not imply any denial of the importance of the OT for Josephus. In some important ways, Josephus's account demonstrates consistency with discussions of the temple and pollution in the OT. Most obviously, Josephus supposes that one result of pollution is the loss of God's presence in the temple, as might be expected of a Jew familiar with texts such as Ezekiel and Jeremiah.[26] Josephus also suggests that judgement could have been avoided if the Jews had repented from their sin.[27] Finally, Josephus views the destruction of the temple as one aspect of the judgement the Jews faced, consistent with OT descriptions of judgement, destruction, and

[24] Josephus, *J.W.* 4.323–4 [Thackery].

[25] Josephus, *J.W.* 6.110 [Thackeray].

[26] This connection is rightly noted by Ben Zvi 2013, 204. See Josephus, *J.W.* 6.300, where priests entering the temple seem to hear a voice saying "We are departing" [Thackeray]. See also *J.W.* 6127: "I call the gods of my fathers to witness and any deity that once watched over this place—for now I believe that there is none" [Thackeray]. Cf. the parallel account provided by Tacitus, *Hist*. 5.13: "Of a sudden the doors of the shrine opened and a superhuman voice cried: 'The gods are departing.'"

[27] So Rajak 2002, 97–98. See Josephus, *J.W.* 5.19 ("Yet might there be hopes for an amelioration of thy lot, if ever thou wouldst propitiate that God who devastated thee!" [Thackeray]), and 5.415–16 ("a way of salvation is still left you, if you will: and the Deity is easily reconciled to such as confess and repent" [Thackeray]).

exile. What this analysis suggests, however, is that first-century Jews could talk about temples and sacrilege (even in regards to the Jerusalem temple) in ways that resonate with major metaphysical pollution while also demonstrating an indebtedness to discussions of temple pollution, judgement, and exile in the OT and without, apparently, perceiving any conflict between these two systems.

3.2.2 – Major Metaphysical Pollution and Josephus's Reading of the LXX

In addition to his use of major metaphysical pollution in *Jewish War*, Josephus also appeals to such pollution concepts in his retelling of OT narratives. As in scholarship on *Jewish War*, here too Josephus's use of major metaphysical pollution often goes unnoticed, but it speaks to the ways in which Jewish writers incorporated these concepts even in the retelling of OT stories that lack them. In this section I will examine Josephus's interpretation of two stories. In the first, I will consider the story of David and Shimei. In the second, I will look at the story of Uzziah, who offers improper sacrifices and faces leprosy and isolation as a result. I will suggest that Josephus uses major metaphysical pollution to clarify the impetus and character of the judgement that appears in both passages.

3.2.2.1 – Shimei, Expulsion, and Judgement

Josephus retells the story of David and Shimei found in 2 Samuel 16. In the biblical, text David arrives in Bahurim and one of Saul's relatives, a man named Shimei, approaches David, curses him, and throws stones at him. He insults David saying: "Out! Out! Murderer! Scoundrel! The Lord has avenged on all of you the blood of the house of Saul, in whose place you have reigned; and the Lord has given the kingdom into the hand of your son Absalom. See, disaster has

overtaken you; for you are a man of blood" (2 Sam 16:7–8).[28] In Shimei's view, God has brought vengeance against David and on behalf of Saul. The disaster David faces is linked clearly and causally to David's identification as a "man of blood" (ὅτι ἀνὴρ αἱμάτων σύ). It is unclear in this account, however, precisely why Shimei wants David to leave. Is Shimei afraid of David? Does he simply hate him? Is there some other potential danger?

Josephus's account makes use of major metaphysical pollution to explain Shimei's desire for expulsion and the logic by which Shimei connects David's crimes to judgement from God. His version reads:

> Samūis only continued the more to curse him and denounce him as one stained with blood and as the author of many crimes. He also bade him leave the country as one under a ban and accursed; and he gave thanks to God for having deprived David of his kingdom and for having exacted punishment of him, through his own son, for the crimes which he had committed against his master (*Ant*. 7.208 [Marcus]).[29]

In Josephus's version David is commanded to leave the country as one "under a ban and accursed" (ἐναγῆ καὶ ἐπάρατον). This use of curse language, including vocabulary of major metaphysical pollution, is unique in Josephus's version compared to LXX texts, although the significance of this is not always noted.[30] Expulsion of and separation from people curses people is common when that person has incurred major metaphysical pollution.[31] Thus, by identifying

---

[28] καὶ οὕτως ἔλεγεν Σεμεεὶ ἐν τῷ καταρᾶσθαι αὐτόν Ἔξελθε ἔξελθε, ἀνὴρ αἱμάτων καὶ ἀνὴρ ὁ παράνομος. Ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπὶ σὲ Κύριος πάντα τὰ αἵματα τοῦ οἴκου Σαούλ, ὅτι ἐβασίλευσας ἀντ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔδωκεν Κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν χειρὶ Ἀβεσσαλὼμ τοῦ υἱοῦ σου· καὶ ἰδοὺ σὺ ἐν τῇ κακίᾳ σου, ὅτι ἀνὴρ αἱμάτων σύ.

[29] ὁ Σαμούις βλασφημῶν διετέλει, μιαιφόνον καὶ πολλῶν ἀρχηγὸν κακῶν ἀποκαλῶν. Ἐκέλευε δὲ καὶ τῆς γῆς ὡς ἐναγῆ καὶ ἐπάρατον ἐξιέναι, καὶ τῷ θεῷ χάριν ὡμολόγει τῆς βασιλείας αὐτὸν ἀφελομένῳ καὶ διὰ παιδὸς ἰδίου τὴν ὑπὲρ ὧν ἥμαρτεν εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ δεσπότην δίκην αὐτὸν εἰσπραξαμένῳ.

[30] For example, Begg 2005, 4:263 n. 801, comments here that Josephus "elaborates on Shimei's opening words to David according to 2 Sam 16:7." He does not speak to the particular ways that Josephus's elaboration resonates with major metaphysical pollution. Similarly, Avioz 2016, 146, does not comment on the use of the word ἐναγής at all.

[31] I earlier cited Plutarch, *Sol.* 12.1–6 and Sophocles, *OT* 1426–1528, as two examples of texts where expulsion follows on the heels of pollution.

David as one who is carrying major metaphysical pollution, Josephus's version provides a rationale for why Shimei wants David out. David's pollution is dangerous to Shimei and possibly the rest of those living in the area. Labelling David as ἐναγής then sets up the next lines concerning the loss of David's kingdom, because it specifies why it is that God punishes David. This is because when one incurs ἄγος, he or she will face inevitable judgement from the gods. To be clear, Josephus may or may not agree with Shimei's perspective on David's guilt. Regardless, his retelling of this story uses major metaphysical pollution to explain why David must be avoided and why he experiences physical judgement in Shimei's eyes.

3.2.2.2 – Uzziah, Sacrilege, and Judgement

Josephus also employs concepts of major metaphysical pollution when he retells the story of King Uzziah's expulsion from the temple.[32] The LXX texts say that Uzziah wrongs (ἀδικέω) the Lord when he enters the temple of the Lord to offer sacrifices (2 Chr 26:16). As he does so, the priests warn him to leave, explaining that such an offering is improper for anyone but the descendants of Aaron to offer (2 Chr 26:18). Uzziah becomes angry, and then, as the text says:

> When he became angry with the priests a leprous disease broke out on his forehead, in the presence of the priests in the house of the LORD, by the altar of incense. When the chief priest Azariah, and all the priests, looked at him, he was leprous in his forehead. They hurried him out, and he himself hurried to get out, because the LORD had struck him. King Uzziah was leprous to the day of his death, and being leprous lived in a separate house, for he was excluded from the house of the LORD (2 Chr 26:19–21).[33]

[32] Ὀζίας. cf. LXX spelling Ὀζείας in 2 Chron 26:16–23.

[33] ἐν τῷ θυμωθῆναι αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς, καὶ ἡ λέπρα ἀνέτειλεν ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ αὐτοῦ ἐναντίον τῶν ἱερέων ἐν οἴκῳ Κυρίου ἐπάνω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τῶν θυμιαμάτων. καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ πρῶτος καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς, καὶ ἰδοὺ αὐτὸς λεπρὸς ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ· καὶ κατέσπευσαν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἔσπευσεν ἐξελθεῖν, ὅτι ἤλεγξεν αὐτὸν Κύριος. καὶ ἦν Ὀζείας βασιλεὺς λεπρὸς ἕως ἡμέρας τῆς τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν οἴκῳ ἀφφουσιὼν ἐκάθητο λεπρός, ὅτι ἀπεσχίσθη ἀπὸ οἴκου Κυρίου.

Josephus's version uses major metaphysical pollution to clarify both the rationale behind Uzziah's judgement and the nature of that judgement, although this detail is frequently missed, even by scholars who posit similarities between Josephus's writing and other ancient Greek writers.[34] Dealing with the rationale behind judgement, Josephus says Uzziah was guilty of impieties against God (εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἀσεβημάτων)[35] because he entered the τέμενος to offer a sacrifice in violation of the law. The word ἀσέβημα is used frequently to indicate sacrilege in Greek texts, and so by using this word instead of ἀδικέω Josephus identifies this crime as a sacrilegious one more explicitly than does the LXX.[36] Sacrilegious crimes are generally met with physical judgement in texts that follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution, and so Josephus here clarifies the connection between crime and punishment.[37] Dealing with the nature of the judgement, Josephus says Uzziah is told to leave the city as one who is ἐναγής.[38] This is not the word Josephus most commonly uses to indicate the uncleanness of leprosy. In other passages he labels leprosy and other bodily defilements using pollution language such as "not

[34] Feldman 1998, 179, argues that Josephus "seeks to win his intellectual audience by presenting them with themes familiar to them from the tragedians." He does not consider whether one way in which he does this is through the use of major metaphysical pollution. See also Mason 2013, who identifies tragic themes in Josephus and does note their connection to pollution, but who studies *Jewish War* rather than the story of Uzziah.

[35] Josephus, *Ant.* 9.227.

[36] The word ἀδικέω refers to a broad range of crimes and is translated as, e.g., "do wrong," "harm," or "injure." See LSJ s.v., ἀδικέω.

[37] Ben Zvi 2013, 39, suggests that Josephus's account weakens the original emphasis on temple and purity in favour of a more "'universal' moral lesson" related to the dangers of pride. It is true that Josephus links the crime of sacrilege to Uzziah's pride, but it is important to note that the logic of sacrilege, pollution, and judgement governs the way in which the story unfolds.

[38] Begg 2000, 283, rightly notes that the use of ἐναγής is rare in Josephus, and he draws attention to the use of this word also in *Ant*. 7.208, but he does not comment further on the significance of this word compared to other pollution langauge.

clean" (μὴ καθαροὺς)[39] or "defiled" (μεμιασμένοις).[40] Here, he uses ἐναγής in a context where it is the result of sacrilege, where it is accompanied by physical judgement, and where the polluted is driven not only from God's presence (emphasised in 2 Chr 26:21) but also from the city, in keeping with the common kinds of consequences associated with major metaphysical pollution.

3.2.2.3 – Conclusions Concerning Josephus and the LXX

In both of these passages, Josephus's reading of the OT reveals reliance on the logic of major metaphysical pollution. In both instances, his use of these concepts of pollution clarifies the driving force behind some instance of judgement and/or some of the particular effects associated with that judgement. There remains one more text to discuss in Josephus, in which he uses major metaphysical pollution in a slightly different manner, namely, to warn against certain behaviours.

3.2.3 – Major Metaphysical Pollution and the Reinterpretation of a Crime as Sacrilege

In the final text I will consider, Josephus appeals to major metaphysical pollution in order to recast a serious crime as sacrilege, tie it to judgement, and then warn against it. He does this in his discussion of the invasion of Scythopolis. In this story, a Jew named Saul fights against his fellow Jews. Although the passage begins with an emphasis on Saul's strength and courage, Josephus quickly turns this praise into condemnation by saying that Saul used these gifts "to the detriment of his countrymen" as he slew Jews who were attacking the city.[41] Josephus interprets this violence against the Jews as an act of sacrilege when he has Saul say: "[we] have been guilty

[39] Josephus, *Ant.* 9.74.

[40] Josphus, *J.W.* 6.427. Cf. passages in the LXX in which leprosy is labelled with pollution language such as Lev 13:3, in which the priest "shall pronounce him [the leper] ceremonially unclean" (μιανεῖ αὐτόν), and Lev 14:44, in which leprosy is called ἀκάθαρτος.

[41] Josephus, *J.W.* 2.469–70.

of the last degree of impiety (ἀσεβέω) towards our own people."[42] This reinterpretation of a crime as an act of sacrilege is, as I noted in the previous chapter, a common tactic in ancient literature.[43]

Once Josephus reinterprets this violence as sacrilege, he ties it to major metaphysical pollution, again in keeping with a common pattern in ancient literature. Saul says that he is ἐναγής.[44] I noted in the previous chapter that one who is ἐναγής is destined for judgement, and I noted further that sometimes this judgement does not occur directly through the work of the gods, but rather through human beings. In some cases, a person can even inflict harm to himself and in so doing resolve major pollution.[45] This is the case in this text, where Saul takes his own life, hoping that by this action he might accomplish a fit retribution for his pollution (ποινὴ τοῦ μιάσματος ἀξία).[46]

Josephus not only uses major metaphysical pollution to establish a connection between this particular crime and judgement, but also to make a more general statement about the danger of such behavour. Josephus closes the story by saying, "So perished a youth who, in virtue of his strength of body and fortitude of soul, deserves commiseration, but who by reason of his trust in aliens met the consequent fate."[47] Josephus embeds a warning in this story, and makes a broader statement, one potentially applicable to other situations, about the danger of trusting "aliens."

---

[42] Josephus, *J.W.* 2.472.

[43] I previously cited Aristotle, *Oec.* 2.2.20 and Seneca, *Ben.* 1.4.5 in this connection.

[44] Josephus, *J.W.* 2.473. Noted by Mason 2013, 194–95.

[45] For self-inflicted judgement that is interpreted as judgement from the gods in response to major metaphysical pollution, see the fate of Philomelus in Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 16.32.1.

[46] Josephus, *J.W.* 2.473.

[47] Josephus, *J.W.* 2.476 [Thackeray].

Reinterpreting violence against one's own countrymen as sacrilege and then warning against that violence creates a powerful deterrant because sacrilege carries with it the danger of judgement.

3.2.4 – Summary of Major Metaphyscial Pollution in Josephus

Table 3 –Major Metaphysical Pollution in Josephus

Source	Cause	Terms	Effect	Resolution
J.W. 2.469–76.	Bloodshed (called sacrilege)	ἐναγής	None described	Destruction of the guilty by humans
J.W. 4.150	Bloodshed	μιαίνω	Loss of God's presence	Destruction of the temple, the guilty, and those in proximity to the guilty by God
J.W. 4.163	Bloodshed	ἄγος	Loss of God's presence	Destruction of the temple, the guilty, and those in proximity to the guilty by God
J.W. 4.202	Dying in the temple	μιαίνω	Loss of God's presence	Destruction of the temple, the guilty, and those in proximity to the guilty by God
J.W. 4.242–3	Bloodshed	μιαίνω	Loss of God's presence	Destruction of the temple, the guilty, and those in proximity to the guilty by God
J.W. 4.323–4	The various polluting actions of the brigands	μιαίνω	Loss of God's presence	Destruction of the temple, the guilty, and those in proximity to the guilty by God

J.W. 5.7–10	Violence against the temple	μιαίνω	Loss of God's presence	Destruction of the temple, the guilty, and those in proximity to the guilty by God
J.W. 5.17–20	Dying in the temple	μύσος	Loss of God's presence	Destruction of the temple, the guilty, and those in proximity to the guilty by God
J.W. 6.93–103	Cessation of sacrifices	μιαίνω	Loss of God's presence	Destruction of the temple, the guilty, and those in proximity to the guilty by God
J.W. 6.110	Bloodshed	μίασμα	Loss of God's presence	Destruction of the temple, the guilty, and those in proximity to the guilty by God
Ant. 7.207–10	Bloodshed	ἐναγής and ἐπάρατος	None described	Not resolved, but tied to physical judgement of various kinds
Ant. 9.222–27.	Sacrilege	ἐναγής	None described	Affliction of the guilty by God

I have now worked through several texts in which Josephus draws on major metaphysical pollution. How does he use this system of pollution and judgement? Each of the instances examined above can be placed in one of two categories. On the one hand, Josephus relies on major metaphysical pollution to establish the impetus behind and nature of some instance of judgment. On the other hand, he uses it to construct a more general warning against deviant behaviour. In the case of the temple's destruction and the stories from the OT, Josephus appeals

to these concepts in the first way. In the story of Saul, Josephus appeals to these concepts in the second way. Importantly, there is no apparent conflict for Josephus between his use of this system and his Jewish identity. He even uses it to discuss the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. Major metaphysical pollution also seems to be part of the way that he reads the OT and makes sense of it. One question that emerges from this is how Josephus's use of this system of pollution compares with other Jews. In the next section, I will look at Philo and ask if he uses major metaphysical pollution in a similar manner.

3.3 – Major Metaphysical Pollution in Philo

Like Josephus, Philo offers us insight into the nature of Jewish/pagan interactions in the first century. As an ambassador to Rome during the reign of Caligula, Philo navigated a complex intercultural dialogue.[48] His writings also bear some similarity, as is often noted, to other Hellenistic writings.[49] At the same time, Philo maintains a staunch commitment to his Jewish identity. A significant portion of his writing deals with the Pentateuch and other topics of importance to Jewish communities. Like Paul, he attacks pagan polytheism and idolatry.[50] He suggests that such practices ultimately lead to atheism[51] and he calls polytheism evil.[52] In some cases, he makes no distinction between the idol and the deity it represents, referring to "gods of

[48] For a recent intellectual biography of Philo see Niehoff 2018.

[49] Philip Richardson argues that Philo is useful both as an example of a Jew writing to a Diaspora audience and as a source for understanding Hellenistic philosophy. See Richardson 2018, 121.

[50] See also, Bekken 2014, 248–55, on Philo's view of Jewish relations with pagans. More detailed comparisons between Paul and Philo are found both in shorter articles (Siegert 2009, 183–91) and in several monographs (e.g., Winter 2002; Worthington 2011; Orrey 2016).

[51] See Philo, *Drunkenness* 110: "For polytheism creates atheism in the souls of the foolish, and God's honour is set at naught by those who deify the mortal" [Colson].

[52] Philo, *Confusion* 11.42 (τῷ πολυθέῳ λεγομένῳ κακῷ).

the different cities who are falsely so called, being fashioned by the skill of painters and sculptors,"[53] and in this way adheres to a pattern of caricaturing pagan worship that is also found in the OT such as Isa 44:9–20.[54] He also, like Paul, applies temple imagery to human persons.[55] It is critical, then, to consider how a Jew who is committed to Jewish monotheism contra paganism might draw on the logic of major metaphysical pollution.

I will deal first with the several texts in Philo that discuss Cain and his fratricide (as presented in Genesis 4). I will show that Philo relies on major metaphysical pollution to clarify both why Cain is punished by God and why he faces the particular manifestations of judgement that he experiences. I will then consider the texts in which Philo reinterprets murder as sacrilege. I will show that by recasting these offences as sacrilege, Philo accounts for the specific penalties prescribed for murderers in the OT. I will next look at two other texts where Philo uses an appeal to major metaphysical pollution to construct a potentially powerful deterrant to behaviours he views as deviant.

3.3.1 – Pollution and Cain's Fratricide

Philo uses major metaphysical pollution extensively in his retelling of the Cain and Abel story. John Byron, in an article dealing with 1 John 3 and Jewish interpretative traditions related to Cain, rightly identifies the presence of these pollution concepts in Philo's retelling of this story.[56] However, Byron's analysis emphasises only the ritual impact of major metaphysical pollution.

---

[53] Philo, *Moses* 2.38.205 [Colson].

[54] Cf. other Jewish texts such as Wis 15:7–17; Pss 115:4–8; Ep Jer; etc. and see Sandelin 2014, 23–24. Feeney 1998, 94, touches on the question of whether the Romans really equated their statues with the divinities represented by them.

[55] Temple/house of God imagery in Philo is found in, e.g., *Rewards* 123; *Creation* 137; *Dreams* 1.149; *Unchangeable* 9, 134; *Cherubim* 98; *Sobriety* 62.

[56] Byron 2007, 530–34.

Byron says ἄγος is "a form of pollution that was most often understood as that which prevents one from being ritually pure."[57] He does not consider the close connection between this pollution and judgement, and so does not consider whether or how Philo might use major metaphysical pollution to clarify the reason behind and nature of Cain's judgement.

> The key LXX text for the discussion of Cain's punishment is Gen 4:10–12. It reads:
>
> And the Lord said, 'What have you done? Listen; your brother's blood is crying out to me from the ground! And now you are cursed from the ground, which has opened its mouth to receive your brother's blood from your hand. When you till the ground, it will no longer yield to you its strength; you will be a fugitive and a wanderer on the earth.[58]

It is clear here that fratricide has led to swift judgement from God. However, the reason why this judgement is necessary and the logic by which these particular expressions of judgement occur remain unclear in this text.

Philo uses major metaphysical pollution to clarify both of these areas. Gen 4:11 LXX reads: ἐπικατάρατος σὺ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἣ ἔχανεν τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς δέξασθαι τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκ τῆς χειρός σου.[59] Philo seems to know a text that is very similar to this, because in *Agriculture* he says: ἐπικατάρατος σὺ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ἣ ἔχανε τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς δέξασθαι τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκ τῆς χειρός σου. With the exception of Philo's use of ἔχανε over ἔχανεν, the similarities are remarkable. But, even though the words ἄγος and ἐναγής do not feature in the LXX versions of

[57] Byron 2007, 531.

[58] καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Τί ἐποίησας; φωνὴ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρὸς μὲ ἐκ τῆς γῆς. καὶ νῦν ἐπικατάρατος σὺ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἣ ἔχανεν τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς δέξασθαι τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκ τῆς χειρός σου. ὅτι ἐργᾷ τὴν γῆν, καὶ οὐ προσθήσει τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῆς δοῦναί σοι· στένων καὶ τρέμων ἔσῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

[59] There is a minor textual variant in Gen 4:11 with some LXX manuscripts reading ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς instead of ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

the Cain and Abel story, Philo does employ both terms frequently in reference to Cain and his fratricide, inserting ἄγος four times[60] and ἐναγής three times in this capacity.[61]

Incorporating major metaphysical pollution into the discussion of Cain's crime gives Philo the resources for explaining the mechanism behind Cain's judgement. In other ancient texts, ἄγος and judgement belong naturally together, and judgement usually takes a physical form. By positing that fratricide leads to ἄγος, and thereby invoking major metaphysical pollution, Philo here creates an expectation of judgement such that the punishment from God is not surprising.

Philo also uses these concepts of pollution to explain why the judgement Cain experiences takes the particular form that it does. Some scholars have suggested that the two different punishments Cain faces in Gen 4:11–12, namely, being cursed from the ground and doomed to the life of a fugitive on the one hand (Gen 4:11 and 4:12b), and unproductive agriculture on the other (Gen 4:12a), are evidence of redactional activity. Jakob Wöhrle contends, "This observation [that there are two punishments], together with the fact that Gen 4:11 connects very well with 4:12b, indicates that Gen 4:12a is another secondary addition to the story of Cain and Abel."[62] For Philo, however, major metaphysical pollution provides a framework within which both results of pollution are plausible. First, by invoking ἄγος, Philo can explain why the ground ceases to be productive. Impeded agricultural activity is a common effect of ἄγος.[63] Philo says: "When he [Cain] is discovered to have incurred the pollution [ἄγος]

[60] He uses this word in Philo, *Agriculture* 5.21–22; *Posterity* 14.50; *Virtues* 37.199; *Worse* 26.96.

[61] He uses this word in Philo, *Flight* 11.60; *Rewards* 12.68; *Worse* 26.96.

[62] Wöhrle 2020, 144.

[63] Crop failure as the result of major metaphysical pollution is seen in texts such as Plutarch, *Rom.* 23.1–24.3 and Pausanias, *Descr.* 7.19.3–6.

of fratricide, it is said: 'Cursed art thou from the ground, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand, with which thou shalt work the ground, and it shall not yield its strength to give it thee.'"[64] That pollution is what ruins the ground is made clear in several texts. In one, Philo says Cain's fratricide is ἄγος, and that it pollutes (μιαίνω) the earth with blood.[65] In another, Philo says Cain was under a curse (ἐναγής) and that this brought μίασμα to the earth and impeded its fruitfulness.[66] So, the presence of major metaphysical pollution here clarifies the logic of unproductive farming. Second, ἄγος provides an explanation for Cain's expulsion, because the acquisition of ἄγος commonly leads to expulsion of the polluted individual in order to protect the wider community from the dangers of pollution.[67] Philo describes this expulsion in a manner that coheres precisely with this common response to ἄγος. He states that Adam and Eve would have surely avoided living in a city with Cain because of his pollution and the apparent danger associated with it.[68]

One might protest at this point that Philo is seriously redefining major metaphysical pollution because in Gen 4 Cain is explicitly protected from physical danger. The Lord says, "Whoever kills Cain will suffer a sevenfold vengeance" and then he puts "a mark on Cain, so that no one who came upon him would kill him" (Gen 4:15). But Philo explains that this

[64] Philo, *Agriculture* 5.21–22 [Colson]. Cf. *Virtues* 37.199; *Rewards* 12.68.

[65] Philo, *Virtues* 37.199.

[66] Philo, *Rewards* 12.68.

[67] As I noted before, this is quite distinct from the kind of exile Israel might experience as a result of accumulated moral pollution in the temple. That pollution is decisively communal in scope, and all Israel experiences judgement through this expulsion. According to the logic of major metaphysical pollution, expulsion is more often restricted to the particular guilty person, who is expelled in order to protect others.

[68] Philo, *Posterity* 14.49–50: "The parents of the murdered Abel would not have brooked dwelling in the same city with his slayer, seeing he had incurred a more defiling guilt [ἄγος] than that of a man-slayer by slaying his brother" [Colson].

apparent act of mercy is still one aspect of the terrible judgment the polluted Cain experiences. He raises the question concerning why Cain was not executed,[69] then explains that death as punishment is "man's idea."[70] Cain is instead afflicted by perpetual grief and fear without hope for atonement.[71] This punishment is apparently even worse than death, and the lack of possibility for atonement fits with major metaphysical pollution.

Philo's reading of the Cain and Abel story involves looking at the text through the lens of major metaphysical pollution. He uses this system to explain both why Cain requires judgement at all, and why the judgement he experiences takes the particular form it does. This is consistent with some of the ways in which Josephus employs major metaphysical pollution. Philo's discussion of Cain comprises a significant portion of all those texts in which he draws on major metaphysical pollution. The next significant group of texts to consider is the collection of texts that relate to murder.

3.3.2 – Murder and Sacrilege

In the second group of texts I will examine, Philo draws on major metaphysical pollution to reinterpret murder as sacrilege and thereby explain the particular penalties prescribed for it in the Law. In *Special Laws*, for example, he says:

> The term murder or manslaughter is used to signify the act of one who has killed a human being, but in real truth that act is a sacrilege [ἱεροσυλία], and the worst of sacrileges; seeing that of all the treasures which the universe has in its store there is none more sacred and godlike than man, the glorious cast of a glorious image, shaped according to the pattern of the archetypal form of the Word. It follows necessarily that the murderer

[69] Philo, *Rewards* 12.69.

[70] Philo, *Rewards* 12.70.

[71] Philo, *Rewards* 12.71–73.

> must be regarded as an offender against piety and holiness, both of which are violated in the highest degree by his action.[72]

Elsewhere in *Special Laws* Philo calls the exposure of infants sacrilege,[73] and in *Decalogue* Philo says the murderer is "guilty of sacrilege, the robbery from its sanctuary of the most sacred of God's possessions,"[74] Not all of these texts contain the vocabulary of major metaphysical pollution (i.e., ἄγος and ἐναγής are absent from *Decalogue* 25.133), but the pattern of reinterpreting a serious crime as sacrilege is shared across these texts. Once he recasts murder as sacrilege, that is, a kind of behaviour that frequently leads to pollution and judgement, he then clarifies in a variety of texts that murder does, in fact, create pollution and lead to judgement.[75]

The fact that Philo sees murder as polluting sacrilege guides his explanation of two biblical directives associated with murder, but this connection between murder as polluting sacrilege and the death penalty typically goes unnoticed, even by scholars writing specifically on murder as sacrilege in Philo.[76] The first directive is the frequent command that murderers be put to death. With this sentiment, Philo agrees. "He [the murderer] must be put to death," Philo argues, "though indeed it is a thousand deaths that he deserves instead of the one which he suffers."[77] He also approvingly cites Moses' prescription that people who expose infants should

---

[72] Philo, *Spec. Laws* 3.15.83.

[73] Philo, *Spec. Laws* 3.20.110.

[74] Philo, *Decalogue* 25.133.

[75] Consider also *Abraham* 33.181 and *Moses* 1.314. Although Philo does not make a clear connection to sacrilege in either of these other texts, murder (of children in the former and of humans who share the common kinship of mankind in the latter) nonetheless results in ἄγος.

[76] See, recently, Cornelis de Vos 2018. He claims Philo is a "passionate defender of the death penalty for murderers" immediately after discussing the concept of murder as sacrilege (pg. 152). He does not, however, tie the two together or note how major metaphysical pollution provides the glue that connects murder to the death penalty.

[77] Philo, *Spec. Laws*, 3.15.84.

face the death penalty.[78] If murder is an act of sacrilege, then associating it with the death penalty makes good sense because sacrilege is often resolved through physical punishments. The second directive is the one found in several OT passages to the effect that one who commits murder can be pulled from the altar for judgement.[79] Philo addresses this in two different passages. In one, after labelling murder as ἄγος, he says it is "no sacrilege to drag such as these [murderers] from the very altar,"[80] thereby using ἄγος as a justification for this command. In the other passage he says, "if they [the murderers] manage to slink in [to the temple], they must be handed over for execution with a declaration to the effect that the holy place does not provide asylum for the unholy" and then he argues that the temple cannot hold people "labouring under the curse of ineffaceable crimes [ἀνεκπλύτοις ἄγεσιν], the pollution of which no length of time will wash away."[81] Again, by saying murder is a sacrilegious act that leads to inexpiable ἄγος, and that judgement is inevitable, Philo explains the command to pull murderers from the altar.

In his discussion of murder, then, Philo says that the offence is, in actual fact, sacrilege. He can thereby tie the offence to judgement and also account for why that offence leads to the particular forms of judgement that are required. This too, is consonant with Josephus's use of major metaphysical pollution. There are also two texts in which Philo draws on major

[78] Philo, *Spec. Laws* 3.20.117.

[79] E.g., "But if someone wilfully attacks and kills another by treachery, you shall take the killer from my altar for execution" (Ex 21:14). As I noted in the previous chapter, under normal circumstances murdering a suppliant at the temple or dragging a suppliant from the temple for judgement is, in itself, a sufficient cause for the creation of ἄγος. See Thucydides, *Hist.* 1.126, and Plutarch, *Rom.* 23.1–24.3, for just two examples of this phenomenon.

[80] Philo, *Confusion* 3.161 [Colson]. Philo is in agreement here with Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 16.56–58.

[81] Philo, *Spec. Laws* 3.15.88–89 [Colson].

metaphysical pollution to build a case for why certain behaviours should be avoided. I will deal with both of these in the next section.

3.3.3 – Pollution as Warning Against Deviant Behaviours

In two texts, major metaphysical pollution provides the rationale for why certain behaviours should be avoided. The first is Philo's retelling of the story of Joseph. In the LXX, Reuben urges his brothers not to kill Joseph, but the LXX provides no further clarification as to why Reuben's argument is compelling to his brothers. It merely records Reuben's words: "Let us not take his life . . . Shed no blood; throw him into this pit here in the wilderness, but lay no hand on him" (Gen 37:21–22). In Philo's retelling, however, Reuben convinces his brothers not to kill Joseph by appealing to the fear of major pollution.[82] Philo expands,

> They were only deterred from committing that most accursed of deeds, fratricide [τὸ μέγιστον ἄγος, ἀδελφοκτονίαν], by the exhortation of the eldest among them, to which they reluctantly yielded. He urged them to keep their souls clear from the abominable act [ὃς παρήνει μὴ ἐφάψασθαι τοῦ μιάσματος], and merely to throw him into one of the deep pits.[83]

While Philo does not explicitly mention the judgement associated with this pollution, he does seem to assume that fear of incurring ἄγος is, itself, potentially sufficient to deter one from murder.

In the other text, Philo discusses a number of sex acts and behaviours that violate gender norms. He unreservedly attacks those who do these things, as well as those who approve of them, arguing that they threaten the foundation of society. In his words, they "render cities desolate and

[82] This is not often mentioned outside of Byron 2007, 531. See the lack of interest in this topic in Hadas-Lebel 2012, 139–45; Niehoff 2018, 121–25.

[83] Philo, *Joseph* 3.13.

uninhabited by destroying the means of procreation."[84] They are therefore, deserving of severe punishments and death. He argues that others could be prevented from joining in this type of behaviour if those who currently carried out these various acts "were cut off without condonation as public enemies, each of them a curse [ἄγος] and a pollution [μίασμα] of his country."[85] Philo here urges that those who violate gender and sex norms should be viewed as ἄγος, and by invoking this pollution he builds a case for the avoidance of the behaviour.

In both of these texts, undesirable behaviour is recast as the source of major metaphysical pollution in order to provide an argument against it. The arguments contained here rely on the fact that the fear of incurring such pollution is so powerful that it may potentially deter someone. This is similar to Josephus's interpretation of Saul's crime against his countrymen, which leads Josephus to make a general statement about the danger of trusting aliens.[86]

3.3.4 – Summary of Major Metaphysical Pollution in Philo

Table 4 – Major Metaphysical Pollution in Philo

Source	Cause	Terms	Effect	Resolution
Agriculture 5.21–22	Fratricide	ἄγος	Cursed ground	None described
Posterity 14.50	Fratricide	ἄγος	Undefined danger to others	None described
Virtues 37.199	Fratricide	ἄγος	Pollution of the earth	Extended torment

[84] Philo, *Spec. Laws*, 3.7.39 [Colson].

[85] Philo, *Spec. Laws*, 3.7.42 [Colson].

[86] Josephus, *J.W.* 2.469–76.

Flight 11.60	Fratricide	ἐναγής	None described	None described
Rewards 12.68	Fratricide	ἐναγής	Pollution of the earth, impeded agricultural productivity	Extended torment
Worse 26.96	Fratricide	ἄγος and ἐναγής	None described	None described
Flight 20.113	Unclear	ἄγος	None described	None described
Confusion 31.161	Murder	ἄγος	None described	Destruction of the guilty by humans (the guilty cannot claim the right of a suppliant at the temple)
Abraham 33.181	Child sacrifice	ἄγος	None described	None described
Moses 1.314	Murder	ἄγος	None described	None described, but potential is there
Joseph 3.13	Fratricide	ἄγος	None described	None described
Embassy 10.66	Murder	ἄγος	Unpurifiable	Not described, but threat of destruction of the guilty by ghosts is mentioned in *Embassy* 9.65
Drunkenness 66–67	Undefined	ἄγος	None described	None described
Decalogue 25.133	Murder (which is called sacrilege)	None	None Described	None Described

Spec. Laws 3.2.18	Fratricide	ἄγος	None described	Judgement from δίκη
Spec. Laws 3.7.42	Violation gender norms, genital mutilation, etc.	ἄγος and μιάματα	None described	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Spec. Laws 3.15.83	Murder (which is called sacrilege)	ἄγος and ἐναγής	Restricted access to temples, inability to be purified	Destruction of the guilty by humans (the guilty cannot claim the right of a suppliant at the temple)
Spec. Laws 3.17.92–93	Sorcerers and poisoners	ἄγος and ἐναγής	None described	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Spec. Laws 3.20.113	Exposure of infants	ἄγος	None described	Destruction of the guilty by humans
Spec. Laws 3.24.135–36	Unintentional Murder	These people are said to be *not* ἐναγής	None described	None described

I have now considered texs in Philo that follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution. We can now ask how Philo uses this system of pollution. As with Josephus, each instance examined above can be placed in one of two categories. On the one hand, Philo appeals to major metaphysical pollution to explain why a certain crime leads to judgement, and why the judgement takes the form that it does. This is the case in his account of Cain and Abel as well as in his interpretation of laws related to punishment for murderers. On the other hand, he reinterprets certain behaviours as the source of major metaphysical pollution, and in the process explains why those behaviours must be avoided. This is the case in his retelling of the Joseph

story as well as in his discussion of gender and sexual norms. In what sense might this material be relevant to the study of Pauline temple imagery? I will now offer some brief conclusions before looking more closely at the Pauline texts.

3.4 – Implications for the Study of Pauline Temple Imagery

In this chapter I considered whether and how Josephus and Philo follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution. My analysis reveals that they do, and frequently. Moreover, they frequently do so in one of two ways. First, they appeal to them in order to explain why a certain instance of judgement occurs, either historically (as in Josephus's understanding of the Jerusalem temple's destruction) or literarily (as in Josephus's understanding of God's judgement against Uzziah), and why the judgement takes the particular form it does (as in Philo's explanation of Cain's punishment for fratricide). Second, they appeal to them to build a case for why one should avoid some deviant behaviour. This is sometimes done by interpreting an act as sacrilege, and other times by simply linking it to grievous pollution.

This analysis addresses questions raised in the introduction that are relevant for the study of Pauline temple imagery. First, it reveals that Jews in the first century sometimes exhibit a pattern of thinking concerning pollution and judgement that is common in the broader Greco-Roman world. Josephus and Philo use major metaphysical pollution freely, even in discussions of the Jerusalem temple and the OT. This shows that even though OT discussions of ritual/moral pollution do not align precisely with the logic of major metaphysical pollution, first-century Jews, as readers of the OT, did not necessarily perceive a conflict between these systems.

Second, since I've shown that at least two first-century Jews draw on major metaphysical pollution, it is historically plausible that Paul, another first-century Jew, could too, even in relation to temples. After all, Josephus uses these concepts as foundational narrative building

blocks in his account of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. It is possible, then, that Paul could likewise use these concepts of pollution in his application of temple imagery to humans.

Third, this analysis clarifies how Jews were using major metaphysical pollution. Josephus and Philo frequently draw on this particular pollution system in order to highlight judgement. This can go a long way towards clarifying how Paul might use these concepts. In the next two chapters, I will exegete 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 and ask if Paul appeals to major metaphysical pollution when he appeals to the image of the temple. At the conclusion of each chapter, I will also compare Paul with Josephus and Philo to ask if Paul's use of this system, if he does use it, tracks with other first-century Jews.

CHAPTER 4 – EXEGESIS OF 1 COR 3:16–17: DIVISION AND SACRILEGE

4.1 – Introduction

In the previous chapter, I studied the use of major metaphysical pollution in Josephus and Philo. I found that they employ this system of pollution frequently, and often towards one of two uses. In many texts, they use it to explain why certain instances of judgement occur and why these judgements take the forms that they do. In other texts, they use it to build an argument against certain behvaiours. This establishes that, since some Jews in the first century used major metaphysical pollution, it is historically plausible that Paul could use it as well. Granting that Paul *could* follow the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution, however, does not prove that he *does*. In this chapter I will look closely at 1 Cor 3:16–17 and ask whether we can discern coherence between Paul's use of temple imagery in this passage and major metaphysical polllution.

This angle of approach differs markedly from most other Pauline scholarship. Much of the important work done on this passage focuses on how it relates to the rest of the Bible. In some cases, this means reading 1 Cor 3:16–17 in conversation with OT texts that share themes or language with it.[1] In other cases, this means approaching Paul's use of the temple as part of a broader analysis of biblical topics, devoting attention more to the development of temple and/or

[1] This type of approach is exemplified by G.K. Beale. His reading of 1 Cor 3:16–17 depends on connections he sees between 1 Cor 3 and Malachi 3–4. This method leads him to read 1 Cor 3:10–17 together as one section in which Paul is describing the "fiery storm winds of the last judgement" (in 1 Cor 3:10–15) that will refine the temple. See Beale 2004, ch. 7, and esp. pg. 245–52,

cultic themes across the canon than to their use in particular contexts.[2] These studies do not devote significant attention to sacrilege and pollution in part because, to varying degrees, they do not engage the many texts that discuss sacrilege from the broader Greco-Roman world.[3] This is true even of the many studies that emphasise the Greco-Roman context of Paul's temple imagery and language. For example, Jay Shanor, John Lanci, Annette Weissenrieder, and Bradley Bitner are more interested in data related to the *construction* of temples in Greek contexts than in discussions of temple *desecration* in Greek literature.[4]

These methodologies concerning the reading of 1 Cor 3:16–17 have led to a variety of interpretations concerning the temple's role in its immediate, rhetorical context. Scholars have concluded, for example, that Paul evokes the temple here because it is a symbol of concord or unity,[5] because with it he aims to teach a "holy way of life,"[6] or because he here marks the

[2] See again, as noted in the history of interpretation in chapter 1, McKelvey 1969, 98–102; Beale 2004. 245–52. Also consider Daly 1978, 61–62. While Daly's work examines temple imagery in 1 Corinthians, it does so as a means to consider a broader question about early Christianity, namely, how Christians could use the language of sacrifice in a meaningful way since they offered no animal sacrifices.

[3] And of course, scholars such as Hogeterp 2006, 320; Regev 2019, 66–67; Fee 1987, 147; and Hays 1997, 57, find material that they categorise as either Greco-Roman or pagan to be relatively less important than OT texts for understanding Paul's temple imagery.

[4] Shanor 1988; Lanci 1997; Weissenrieder 2012; Bitner 2015b. See also Eger 1918, 1919; Burford 1969. These latter two scholars provide some of the foundational research on which Shanor, Lanci, Bitner, and other biblical scholars have depended in this regard. Consider also the often-cited Vitruvius, *de Architectura*, whose writings are important for e.g., Weissenrieder's argument.

Other scholars who are interested in data from the broader Greco-Roman world, but without discussion of sacrilege, include Böttrich 1999 and Richardson 2018. Liu 2013, does make scattered references to sacrilege (e.g., on page 165–73) but provides no sustained analysis. Surprisingly, he only cites Robert Parker's *Miasma* (a seminal work on purity and pollution in Greek religion) once on page 26. Kuck 1992, chap. 3, discusses post-mortem judgement in Greco-Roman literature (which is a different kind of judgement), but does not explore the relationship between judgement and sacrilege.

[5] Mitchell 1993, 104. Cf. Lanci 1997, 107: "The evidence suggests that just as was the case for the common people who participated in Vespasian's rededication of the Capitoleum in Rome, temples did sometimes appear as icons of civic identity in the eyes of many types of people. This attribute of temples is a good part of what lies behind Paul's use of the figure of the community as a temple."

[6] Hogeterp 2006, 384.

realisation of the end-time temple.[7] Despite the variety of conclusions reached by these studies, they share in that they put relatively little emphasis on the judgement of 1 Cor 3:17. What are we to make of this judgement, and what sort of role does it play in Paul's argument? By what logic does this judgement operate, why does it happen, and what does it look like? One way to attempt an answer to these questions is to place 1 Cor 3:16–17 in conversation with the system of major metaphysical pollution that undergirds so many discussions of sacrilege and ask whether there is coherence between the two. If there is, we may come to a better understanding of the destruction from God in 1 Cor 3:17, which may then cause us to understand the temple's role in the argument more clearly.

My attempt to answer these questions will proceed in six steps. The first step is to clarify the shape of the argument in 1 Cor 3:1–23. Many scholars treat these verses together as one section, such that 1 Cor 3:16–17 is seen as a continuation of the topic in 1 Cor 3:5–15. It is worth looking at this more closely, because how one understands these verses affects how one will identify the target of Paul's argument, the behaviour that destroys the temple, and the nature of the judgement following that destruction. Coming to different conclusions regarding these elements could also potentially lead to different conclusions concerning the resonance between 1 Cor 3:16–17 and major metaphysical pollution. Second, after considering the shape of 1 Cor 3:1–23, I will revisit the issue of the people towards whom 1 Cor 3:16–17 is directed. Is it Apollos, some other teachers, or the Corinthians themselves, and what are they doing that can destroy a temple? This too will impact how we read this passage in conversation with major metaphysical pollution.

[7] Beale 2004, 251.

After examining these issues, I will be able to compare more closely the logic of 1 Cor 3:16–17 with the logic of major metaphysical pollution. I will do this by comparing Paul's application of temple imagery with the cause, effect, and means of resolution associated with this pollution system. So, my third step is to determine if Paul describes threats against the temple in ways that echo the language or style of sacreligious acts in the broader Greco-Roman world. If he does, then he may be activating the logic of major metaphysical pollution. Fourth, I will ask about the effects of this threat against the temple. Does Paul insinuate that certain acts will drive away God's presence, a fear common in the OT but less common in writers appealing to major metaphysical pollution? Fifth, I will examine what it means for God to "destroy" in 1 Cor 3:17. Does he destroy the temple or a guilty person, and how does he do it? I will conclude by comparing Paul's argument concerning the temple with parallels from ancient literature that deal with sacrilege and polllution and by comparing it with parallels from his fellow first-century Jews, Josephus and Philo.

4.2 – The Relationship Between 1 Cor 3:16–17 and its Context

The first step in this comparison is to analyse the shape of Paul's argument in 1 Cor 3. An enormous volume of secondary literature on 1 Corinthians maintains that 1 Cor 3:16–17 continues the themes of 1 Cor 3:5–15 in order to threaten eschatological judgment against teacher(s) who build improperly on the foundation of Christ. Bitner is one of the many scholars who affirms that the themes of 1 Cor 3:12–15 continue into 1 Cor 3:16–17. He says, the "apocalyptic assertions" from the earlier verses of 1 Cor 3 "climax in the crashing wordplay of 3:17" and this "stresses the finality of divine judgment on one convicted of bad ministry

practice."[8] For him, the *teacher* of the Corinthians is the object of judgement, and he is judged for his poor ministry. Similarly, Kent Yinger says, "Those who 'destroy God's temple' [in 3:17] *are not a different group (e.g., enemies of the gospel; nonbelievers) from those in view in verses 14–15*. Rather this new description highlights the risk entertained by any teacher who builds with human wisdom."[9] Again, it is the teacher, who builds poorly, who is judged. The precise interpretation of 1 Cor 3 naturally varies, but this position regarding the connection between 1 Cor 3:5–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17 is common and it affects how scholars see the nature of the judgement(s) described in the these verses, the context(s) in which these judgements take place, the target of Paul's rhetoric, and the kind of behaviour that destroys the temple.[10]

Three areas need to be considered, however, to determine whether we ought to see 1 Cor 3:16–17 as part of the same point in Paul's argument as 1 Cor 3:5–15. First is the wider context of 1 Cor 3. What arguments are made in 1 Cor 3:1–23 and how do they fit together? Within this chapter's arguments, how should we understand the place of 1 Cor 3:5–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17? Second is the presence or absence of language that would clearly connect 1 Cor 3:15 and 1 Cor 3:16. Does the use of οὐκ οἴδατε tell us how we should understand the relationship between these verses? Third, and perhaps most important, is the content of 1 Cor 3:5–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17. Do the things said in these two sets of verses make the same point, and are they even talking about the same thing? Addressing these issues will then open new questions about the target of Paul's rhetoric, the behaviour against which he speaks, and the nature of the judgement he

[8] Bitner 2015b, 273.

[9] Yinger 1999, 224 (emphasis mine).

[10] For only a few more examples, consider Gärtner 1965, 59–60; Kuck 1992, 187; Hollander 1994, 103; Smit 2002, 249; Sampley 2002, 831; Beale 2004, 251; Hogeterp 2006, 316–22; Mihaila 2009, 37 and 42. Each of these scholars leans towards an eschatological understanding of God's judgment in 1 Cor 3:17 and each, in his own way, bases this reading on the belief that 1 Cor 3:17 continues themes from 1 Cor 3:10–15.

envisions in 1 Cor 3:16–17. These questions are critical in determining whether and how Paul's argument follows a pattern of thinking common to discussions of sacrilege.

4.2.1 – 1 Cor 3:5–15 in the Context of 1 Cor 3

To determine how 1 Cor 3:5–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17 relate to one another, we must first understand the context of 1 Cor 3. This chapter is bracketed by attacks on the Corinthians' divisive behaviour. The first bracket appears in 1 Cor 3:1–4. A concentration of words in the second person plural indicates that Paul is directly addressing the Corinthians. These words are highlighted below in bold and underlined.

> 3:1 Κἀγώ, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἠδυνήθην λαλῆσαι **ὑμῖν** ὡς πνευματικοῖς ἀλλ' ὡς σαρκίνοις, ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ. [2] γάλα **ὑμᾶς** ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα· οὔπω γὰρ **ἐδύνασθε**. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν **δύνασθε**, [3] ἔτι γὰρ σαρκικοί **ἐστε**. ὅπου γὰρ ἐν **ὑμῖν** ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις, οὐχὶ σαρκικοί **ἐστε** καὶ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον **περιπατεῖτε**; [4] ὅταν γὰρ λέγῃ τις· Ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου, ἕτερος δέ· Ἐγὼ Ἀπολλῶ, οὐκ ἄνθρωποί **ἐστε**;

Paul criticises the Corinthians by saying they are fleshly (σαρκίνοις), infants (νηπίοις), and unable to eat meat (γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα· οὔπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε). He makes it clear, however, that the source of their immaturity, and hence, the target of his invective, is actually their divisiveness. This is because it is when they are full of jealousy (ζῆλος) and strife (ἔρις), and when they claim to be "of Paul" or "of Apollos," that they are living in a merely human manner.[11]

[11] So Clarke 2006, 110, who says "Paul then expands what he is referring to by this jealousy and quarrelling. It is the divisive party-spirit which brands the Corinthians as secular in leadership."

The second bracket appears in 1 Cor 3:18–23. Although Paul's imperatives here are given in the 3rd person, contextual factors indicate that Paul is again addressing the Corinthians as in 1 Cor 3:1–4. Following the use of the 3rd person in 1 Cor 3:18 (μωρὸς γενέσθω, ἵνα γένηται σοφός) Paul clarifies that he aims to correct the person *among you* (ἐν ὑμῖν). Similarly in 1 Cor 3:21, the 3rd person καυχάσθω is followed by repeated second person plurals that confirm everything belongs to the Corinthians (ὑμῶν in 1 Cor 3:21–22 and ὑμεῖς in 1 Cor 3:23). The main thrust of this section, marked by ὥστε in 1 Cor 3:21, is that the Corinthians should not boast in human beings (ἐν ἀνθρώποις). This marks another attack on Corinthian division like the one in 1 Cor 3:1–4.

In contrast to 1 Cor 3:1–4 and 1 Cor 3:18–23, 1 Cor 3:5–15 does not correct Corinthian division by direct command or criticism of their divisiveness, but rather makes an argument about Paul and Apollos that minimises their relative importance compared to God, and lays a foundation for why the Corinthians should not boast in human beings. The shift in focus is indicated by the opening questions of 1 Cor 3:5: "What is Apollos? What is Paul?" Paul then answers these questions by describing in greater detail both his and Apollos's roles. His description accomplishes two things. First, it subordinates their work to God's. He notes that Paul plants and Apollos waters, but emphasises that God gives the growth (1 Cor 3:6). Lest the Corinthians think that those doing each of these three tasks are equal in status, Paul clarifies that neither the planter nor the waterer are anything, but only the one who gives the growth, namely, God (1 Cor 3:7), and that He and Apollos are fellow workers serving God.[12] Second, it

[12] In light of the context in which Apollos and Paul are subordinated to God, it seems more likely to me that the first genitive in 1 Cor 3:9 (θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί) is either objective ("fellow workers serving God") or possessive ("fellow workers who belong to God"). I here follow Brookins and Longenecker 2016, 73.

establishes that their work is not ultimately judged by the Corinthians. Instead, it is judged on the day and through fire (1 Cor 3:13), and only then will the quality of the work be revealed. The Corinthians need not, therefore, elevate the teachers, because these teachers are subordinate to God and are finally accountable to God.

Since 1 Cor 3:5–15 demonstrates a shift in focus (from the Corinthians to Paul and Apollos) and topic (from Corinthian divisiveness to the status of God's servants), and since 1 Cor 3:18–23 picks up again the topic and theme of 1 Cor 3:1–4, it seems that 1 Cor 3:5–15 is a sub-section of 1 Cor 3. Determining this much provides clarity concerning the phases of Paul's argument, but it leaves one question unanswered, namely, to which section does 1 Cor 3:16–17 belong? Does it continue the description of teachers, their work, and its evaluation, or does it mark a return to the criticism of Corinthian division? In the next section, I will consider the presence of οὐκ οἴδατε and ask if it clarifies for us the relationship between 1 Cor 3:5–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17.

4.2.2 – Οὐκ οἴδατε: The Relationship Between 1 Cor 3:5–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17

Paul introduces the idea that the Corinthians are the temple of God with οὐκ οἴδατε.[13] Numerous scholars note the frequency with which Paul uses οὐκ οἴδατε in 1 Corinthians (9 times in this letter alone), and they commonly ask questions about its use and the Corinthians' prior knowledge. That is, scholars ask whether the Corinthians already did know or should have known they were God's temple.[14] Some fine studies have been produced that probe this

[13] I say "the" ναὸς θεοῦ because definite pre-verbal predicate nominatives are usually anarthrous (although this does not mean that every pre-verbal predicate nominative that is anarthrous is also definite). See Wallace 1996, 256–70; interacting especially with Harner 1973, and building on the much earlier work of Colwell 1933.

[14] Suh 2020, 27, argues, "Paul expected the Corinthians to reply, 'Yes, we know we are the ναὸς θεοῦ.' Additionally, the rhetorical force of this question serves as warning that one's ignorance of the Corinthian assembly as God's temple would not exempt a transgressor from punishment." Macaskill 2013, 155, claims the content of 1

question.[15] I am not concerned, however, with whether the Corinthians already knew or should have known the information Paul shares in 1 Cor 3:16–17. Instead, I aim to answer whether οὐκ οἴδατε provides any insight into the relationship between 1 Cor 3:15 and 1 Cor 3:16. The phrase οὐκ οἴδατε appears in Paul's writings in three different patterns: immediately following μὴ γένοιτο, immediately following ἤ, and standing alone. The verses in which each form appears are detailed in the chart below.

Table 5 – Οὐκ Οἴδατε in Paul

Following μὴ γένοιτο	Following ἤ	Standing Alone
Rom 6:15–16	Rom 11:2	1 Cor 3:16
1 Cor 6:15–16[16]	1 Cor 6:2	1 Cor 6:3
	1 Cor 6:9	1 Cor 6:15
	1 Cor 6:19	1 Cor 9:13
		1 Cor 9:24

Each pattern of usage functions distinctly in the discourse, and we must attend to these different functions in order to understand the particular function of οὐκ οἴδατε in 1 Cor 3:16. I will analyse

Cor 3:16 is a "notion already held by his readers." Thiselton 2000, 316, says the "principle at issue is axiomatic for the Christian and should not have escaped attention as a cardinal element in the community's thinking." Many scholars think 1 Cor 3:16 appeals to Paul's earlier preaching at Corinth (e.g., McKelvey 1969, 93; Gaston 1970, 179). This sometimes leads to the suggestion that 2 Cor 6:14—7:1 contains Paul's first presentation of the community as a temple. Such a thesis remains speculative, however. See the discussions on the date, authorship, and transmission of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 in Kleine 2002, 324–37; Walker 2001, 199–209; Brooke 2014.

[15] For example, Edsall 2013, attends to the use of "do you not know" questions in other Greek literature in comparison with Paul, and he concludes that whether Paul expects his audience already to know the things introduced by οὐκ οἴδατε varies from passage to passage.

[16] Note also the presence of ἤ in the variant reading of 1 Cor 6:16.

the ways in which Paul uses οὐκ οἴδατε and argue that when the phrase appears alone, it does not clarify the relationship between what precedes and what follows, and so we must rely on context to determine connections or lack thereof between sections.

4.2.2.1 – The Use of Οὐκ Οἴδατε Following Μὴ Γένοιτο

When οὐκ οἴδατε follows μὴ γένοιτο in Paul, it introduces the reason that Paul rejects a false conclusion. This has been argued extensively by scholars of diatribe. Rudolf Bultmann, for example, notes that when μὴ γένοιτο appears in Paul, not only "schlägt er den Einwand einfach durch μὴ γένοιτο nieder," but he also works to prove his opponent wrong and justify his own view.[17] Later scholars concur, with Stanley Stowers highlighting the logical connection between statements rejected by μὴ γένοιτο and the argument that follows when he says, "Paul throws out an objection and rejects it with μὴ γένοιτο. The reason for the rejection, then, sets up the following new discussion."[18] Abraham Malherbe, likewise, claims that Paul supports his rejections and then introduces his response with phrases such as ἀλλά, γάρ, or οὐκ οἴδατε.[19]

In Rom 6:15, Paul presents the view he wishes to refute in the form of a question: "What then? Should we sin because we are not under law but under grace?" He then rejects this false conclusion with μὴ γένοιτο. The following sentence does mark a transition in the sense that it introduces the analogy of slavery, but it is also connected tightly to Paul's rhetorical question because it provides the counterargument to that false conclusion. One should not go on sinning

[17] Bultmann 1910, 67.

[18] Stowers 1981, 177.

[19] Malherbe 1980, 236. See also, Fisk 1996, 552. This is not to say that ἀλλά, γάρ, and οὐκ οἴδατε are all doing the exact same thing. Each word can nuance the relationship between the information Paul rejects and the new information he gives. My point is only to note how μὴ γένοιτο preceding οὐκ οἴδατε might shape the way we read the rhetorical question.

because, "if you present yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness."[20] Likewise in 1 Cor 6:15–16, Paul raises the question of whether one should join his or her σῶμα, itself a part of Christ, with a πόρνη. He rejects this conclusion with a resounding μὴ γένοιτο. The immediately following material introduced by οὐκ οἴδατε, presents the reason why this is problematic, namely, that the one joining with a πόρνη becomes one flesh with her.[21] In both cases in which οὐκ οἴδατε follows μὴ γένοιτο in Paul, the information introduced by οὐκ οἴδατε provides a further explanation for the refutation indicated by μὴ γένοιτο, and so it indicates that the verses are linked together into one argument.

4.2.2.2 – The Use of Οὐκ Οἴδατε Following Ἤ

When οὐκ οἴδατε follows ἤ, it introduces content that substantiates immediately previous material and provides the rationale or explanation for Paul's argument. The disjunctive conjunction ἤ suggests an "alternative possibility to the idea to which it is connected."[22] Timothy Brookins and Bruce Longenecker claim that the use of ἤ preceding οὐκ οἴδατε in 1 Corinthians "implies a counter-scenario, which is back-supplied by the listener's mental register through deduction"[23] such that knowing the content Paul provides in the rhetorical question should lead naturally to accepting Paul's argument. Not all scholars accept such an interpretation. Chrys Caragounis in

[20] So Morris 1988, 261; Kruse 2012, 180.

[21] Richardson 2018, 177.

[22] Wallace 1996, 672.

[23] Brookins and Longenecker 2016, 133.

particular compares verses that use οὐκ οἴδατε alone with those that include ἢ[24] and claims there is "no reason whatsoever" why Paul should not have used ἢ in both sets of verses.[25] An analysis of the instances in which Paul uses ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε, however, demonstrates that each appearance of ἢ prior to οὐκ οἴδατε marks a verse that supports the point made immediately prior to it.

In Rom 11:2, Paul claims that God will not reject the people he foreknew. Paul introduces his supporting data with ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε. This could be presented sequentially as follows:

Statement: "God has not rejected his people whom he foreknew." (Rom 11:2a)

Reason why this is the case: "Do you not know what the scripture says of Elijah . . . So too at the present time there is a remnant, chosen by grace." (Rom 11:2b–5)

The question introduced in 11:2b directly relates to and supports the point Paul made in 11:2a.[26] Because God did not reject his people in the days of Elijah, but maintained a remnant, Paul is confident that God has still not rejected his people.

In 1 Cor 6:2 as well, ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε introduces a rhetorical question that lends support to the problem of taking other believers before the ἄδικοι in 6:1.

Issue: "Do you dare to take it to court before the unrighteous, instead of taking it before the saints?" (1 Cor 6:1)

Reason why this is problematic: "Do you not know that the saints will judge the world?" (1 Cor 6:2)

---

[24] And he erroneously includes 1 Cor 9:13 in this list. See Caragounis 2006, 209.

[25] Caragounis 2006, 210.

[26] This is the only place where Paul uses οὐκ οἴδατε to introduce a Scriptural quotation. Note also Jewett and David 2006, 655, who claim: "The particle 'or' (ἤ) that opens this sentence is typical in rhetorical questions (as in 3:29) that raise points in antithesis to the foregoing that should be generally accepted by audiences." They thereby note the same kind of connection I am making between the presence of ἤ and Paul's provision of explanatory data in support of his argument.

As Brookins and Longenecker have claimed, "The Corinthians ought to know that they will judge the world, and therefore, naturally, ought to know not to go to law before the unbelieving."[27]

The same is true also of 1 Cor 6:9.

Issue: "In fact, to have lawsuits at all with one another is already a defeat for you. Why not rather be wronged (ἀδικεῖσθε)? Why not rather be defrauded (ἀποστερεῖσθε)? But you yourselves wrong (ἀδικεῖτε) and defraud (ἀποστερεῖτε)—and believers at that." (1 Cor 6:7–8)

Reason why this is problematic: "Do you not know that wrongdoers (ἄδικοι) will not inherit the kingdom of God?" (1 Cor 6:9)

The repetition of ἄδικος/ἀδικέω makes the point clear. Doing wrong (ἀδικέω) disqualifies one from the kingdom. Therefore, if the Corinthians know this, then they should also understand the reason why they should not do wrong (ἀδικέω) themselves.[28]

In 6:18–19, the appearance of ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε introduces a further explanation for the danger of πορνεία.

Issue: "Shun fornication! Every sin that a person commits is outside the body; but the fornicator sins against the body itself" (1 Cor 6:18)

Reason why this is problematic: "Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God, and that you are not your own?" (1 Cor 6:19)

[27] Brookins and Longenecker 2016, 133.

[28] Fee 1987, 242.

Paul adds weight to his prohibition against πορνεία by explaining that the one committing πορνεία sins not only against his own body, but also against the temple. If the Corinthians were aware of this, they would presumably understand the gravity of the sin and avoid it (at least Paul expects they would).[29] So, in every instance in Paul's extant letters where οὐκ οἴδατε follows ἤ, it introduces material that could be taken as a rationale or explanation for Paul's argument.

4.2.2.3 – The Use of Οὐκ Οἴδατε Standing Alone

When οὐκ οἴδατε appears alone, that is, without μὴ γένοιτο or ἤ preceding it, it does not indicate any particular logical relationship between the rhetorical question it introduces and what precedes it.[30] This can be seen by considering the distinct uses towards which it is put in 1 Corinthians. In 1 Cor 6:3, Paul seems to expand the idea from 1 Cor 6:2.[31] That is, Paul argues that the saints will not only judge the world, but also that they will judge even the angels. It does not seem to be the case, however, that οὐκ οἴδατε always appears before such an expanse. In other cases, the phrase seems to introduce new material that begins a new section of argument, rather than introducing material that expands on the previous argument. In 1 Cor 6:15, οὐκ οἴδατε introduces the idea of the union between the Corinthians' bodies and Christ (an idea that is new

[29] This text is, of course, vital to my thesis, and so I will consider the logic by which it operates more closely in the next chapter. For now, it is sufficient simply to note that the use of ἤ οὐκ οἴδατε signals a logical connection between 1 Cor 6:18 and 1 Cor 6:19.

[30] The fact that οὐκ οἴδατε by itself does not necessarily indicate any particular kind of relationship between two verses may be part of the reason why Pauline scholars are so often divided regarding the relationship between the temple in 1 Cor 3:16 and the building and garden in 1 Cor 3:5–15. E.g., Robertson and Plummer 1950, 59; McKelvey 1969, 98–100, 108; Conzelmann 1975, 73–78; Kuck 1992, 169; Thiselton 2000, 297; Bonnington 2004, 155; Schrage 2008a, 1:287, all treat the three images in 1 Cor 3:5–17 separately, whereas Mitchell 1993, 98–111; Welborn 2005, 238–39; and Hogeterp 2006, 311–31, link the temple with the building and Beale 2004, 245–50; and Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 151, treat all three images together.

[31] So Conzelmann 1975, 105.

in this letter), which then governs what follows in 1 Cor 6:16–17. In both 1 Cor 9:13 and 1 Cor 9:24, οὐκ οἴδατε seems to introduce a new image from which Paul builds a new line of argument. In 1 Cor 9:13, it introduces the concept of the one serving at the altar and receiving compensation for it,[32] while in 1 Cor 9:24 it introduces a new metaphor of athletics from which Paul argues that one should exercise self-control.[33]

If οὐκ οἴδατε, standing alone, sometimes appears before material that expands the immediately preceding material and other times appears before material that initiates a new line of argumentation, then it is not possible to determine the particular kind of relationship between the verses preceding and following it based solely on its presence. If this is true, then we cannot rely on its presence in 1 Cor 3:16 to determine whether 1 Cor 3:16–17 continues the topic and argument from 1 Cor 3:5–15 or else marks a shift in the argument. Instead, we must more closely compare the content of 1 Cor 3:16–17 with the content of 1 Cor 3:5–15 in order to see if they are talking about the same thing.

4.2.3 – Comparing the Content of 1 Cor 3:10–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17

Does the content of 1 Cor 3:16–17 seem to refer to the same thing as the content of 1 Cor 3:5–15? To be sure, some scholars would answer in the affirmative. For example, G.K. Beale says, "That Paul compares God's people to a temple in verses 10–15 is apparent from the specific

[32] With Garland 2003, 414, who says, "It may seem that Paul is piling up the proofs unnecessarily, and 9:13–14 appears to be affixed to the conclusion as an afterthought. But he may be shifting the argument to another level from compensation for secular work to compensation for religious service." Either way, Garland sees 9:13–14 as a separate proof from what precedes it.

[33] It is common to read 1 Cor 9:24, as I do, as the introduction to a new section of Paul's argument. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 433, think it "seems to be a transition passage moving from Paul's example of foregoing rights to the issue of keeping or forfeiting one's eternal reward." Thiselton 2000, 708–9, lists 1 Cor 9:24–27 as one of "three categories of examples" related to the principles of forbearance (the other two being found 1 Cor 9:1–23 and 1 Cor 10:1–13). Conzelmann 1975, 161, says, "The section consisting of vv 24–27 is unified in style and content and stands out from its context."

description of the structure . . . The only other place in Scripture where a 'foundation' of a building is laid and 'gold,' 'silver,' and 'precious stones' are 'built' upon the foundation is Solomon's temple."[34] For him, language shared between these two sections suggests a thematic unity, which leads Beale to blend these two sections in his exegesis. Even so, while there are some signs of thematic continuity, two other features of this text suggest that, while the *theme* of the temple may span 1 Cor 3:10–3:17, the actual arguments being made differ.

The first feature is the movement from the construction of a building to the destruction of a building. In 1 Cor 3:10–15, Paul introduces the point that he laid a foundation and another builds on it. He then discusses the nature of building material and the need to build with care. Some of the materials referenced do evoke the construction of a temple (both in the LXX and in other Greek texts),[35] and so there are similarities between 1 Cor 3:10–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17, but in 1 Cor 3:16–17 there is no longer any discussion of building. Instead, Paul turns to the danger of destroying what is built, namely, the temple constituted by the Corinthians. This means that 1 Cor 3:10–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17 could actually be making two distinct points in Paul's argument, even if they share in their use of temple themes and language.

The second feature is the way judgement in 1 Cor 3:10–15 and in 1 Cor 3:16–17 are discussed. The context, object, nature, and result of judgement differ between these two sections.

---

[34] Beale 2004, 246–47. Cf. the analysis of 1 Cor 3 in Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 151; Frayer-Griggs 2016, chap. 6; Suh 2020, 26.

[35] In 1 Chron 29:2 LXX the similarities to 1 Cor 3:12 are obvious. The description of construction in this text reads: κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν ἡτοίμακα εἰς οἶκον θεοῦ μου χρυσίον, ἀργύριον, χαλκόν, σίδηρον, ξύλα, λίθους σόομ καὶ πληρώσεως καὶ λίθους πολυτελεῖς καὶ ποικίλους, καὶ πάντα λίθον τίμιον, καὶ πάριον πολύ. It is not generally noted, however, that the kinds of materials Paul alludes to are not unique to the construction of the temple in the Bible. Consider Plutarch, *Per.* 12.6, who lists λίθος, χαλκός, ἐλέφας, χρυσός, ἔβενος, κυπάρισσος among the materials for grand building projects; and Diodorus Siculus 1.46.4, who describes a temple made of ἄργυρον καὶ χρυσὸν καὶ τὴν δι' ἐλέφαντος καὶ λιθείας πολυτέλειαν. Paul may, therefore, be drawing on language of the OT, but the use of such language would not have seemed novel in ancient world.

The context in which the work of the builders is tested in 1 Cor 3:13 is "the day" (ἡ ἡμέρα). All mention of the day is absent in 1 Cor 3:16–17.[36] The object of judgement in 1 Cor 3:12–15 is the builder's work (τὸ ἔργον), which will become visible (φανερός), because the day will disclose (δηλόω) it, and fire will reveal (ἀποκαλύπτω) it. It will then be tested (δοκιμάζω) by fire (1 Cor 3:13) and shown to be either durable or combustible. In 1 Cor 3:16–17, it is not the work of the temple destroyer that is judged. Instead, it is the temple destroyer himself. Throughout 1 Cor 3:5–15, the nature of judgement is evaluative. That is, the testing determines of what sort the work is (1 Cor 3:13), and this determination then provides the basis either for rewards (μισθός in 1 Cor 3:8 and 3:14) or loss (indicated by ζημιόω in 1 Cor 3:15). There is no mention of evaluation or rewards in 1 Cor 3:16–17, only the assurance that temple destroyers are destroyed. Finally, in 1 Cor 3:12–15, evaluation of the work results in the *work*, not the *builder*, burning up or remaining. Indeed, it is emphasised precisely that the one who builds does not, himself, burn up. Paul says that this person is saved regardless of the result of the judgement (1 Cor 3:15). In 1 Cor 3:16–17, by contrast, the one who destroys the temple is himself destroyed.[37] These two sections of 1 Cor 3 do not seem to be talking about exactly the same thing. Rather, they seem to be detailing two different kinds of judgement, taking place in two different sets of circumstances, directed against two different objects, and resulting in two different consequences.

So, analysis of the content of these two sections exposes considerable differences between them. There are thematic similarities between these two sections, but despite these, they could reflect two distinct stages in Paul's argument. While 1 Cor 3:10–15 contains Paul's

[36] This, alone, would be insufficient to prove disjunction between these two sections, especially since the day goes unmentioned also in 1 Cor 3:5–9. However, when combined with the rest of the features I am highlighting, the distinction between 1 Cor 3:5–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17 becomes more likely.

[37] Rightly noted by DeNeui 2008, 181.

discussion of building the temple, 1 Cor 3:16–17 contains a discussion of destroying it. Judgement is present in both sections, but they do not look like the same judgement, taking place in response to the same circumstances, against the same objects, or with the same results.

4.2.4 – Summary

I have considered whether 1 Cor 3:16–17 is a distinct part of Paul's argument, making a different point from 1 Cor 3:5–15. I analysed three data points. I argued that 1Cor 3:5–15 is a sub-section in Paul's overall argument in 1 Cor 3:1–23. I urged that the presence of οὐκ οἴδατε standing alone does not mark any particular logical relationship between 1 Cor 3:5–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17. I noted that the content of 1 Cor 3:10–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17 differ significantly, and so may be making two different points in Paul's argument. These points, taken together, make it likely that 1 Cor 3:16–17 is not a continuation of the argument in 1 Cor 3:5–15, but rather a new stage in Paul's argument. I would therefore label the main sections of 1 Cor 3 as follows.

Table 6 – The Shape of 1 Corinthians 3

Verse Reference	Topic
3:1–4	The immaturity of the Corinthians (critique of their division)
3:5–15	The proper evaluation of the teachers
3:16–17	The destruction of the temple destroyer
3:18–23	Wisdom and boasting (critique of Corinthian division)

If 1 Cor 3:16–17 is distinct from what precedes, then we must re-evaluate several elements of Paul's argument in these verses. Namely, we cannot assume that Paul is talking in 1 Cor 3:16–17 about some kind of eschatological judgement directed against teachers or apostles who threaten

the temple by building improperly on the foundation of Christ. That view depends on grouping 1 Cor 3:5–15 with 1 Cor 3:16–17. In the next section, I will re-evaluate who the temple destroyer is and how he/she/they might destroy the temple. This is vital for our comparison with major metaphysical pollution because judgement is such an important aspect of this system, and so common following acts of sacrilege.

4.3 – Who Destroys the Temple, and How?

My evaluation of who destroys the temple and how he/she/they might do it will proceed in two sections. First, I will look at the broader context of 1 Corinthians, especially how Paul talks to and about the teachers (Apollos, etc.) and the Corinthians in order to determine which group makes better sense as the object of destruction in 1 Cor 3:17. Second, once I reach a conclusion, I will consider the themes of 1 Cor 1—4 to ascertain what behaviour is the best candidate for the thing that destroys the temple. Establishing who destroys the temple and how is necessary for determining whether Paul presents this destruction as an act of sacrilege in a way that follows the logic of major metaphysical pollution. I will consider that question in the next major section.

4.3.1 – The Object of Paul's Warning in 1 Cor 3:16–17

As noted earlier, many Pauline scholars link 1 Cor 3:5–15 to 1 Cor 3:16–17 and therefore believe the threat of destruction in 1 Cor 3:17 is directed against those who garden or build in 1 Cor 3:5–15. I have just suggested that 1 Cor 3:16–17 is not making the same point as 1 Cor 3:5–15. This means we cannot assume that those threatened in 1 Cor 3:16–17 are the same as those discussed in 1 Cor 3:5–15. Identifying who is threatened remains difficult, however, because the indefinite pronoun in 1 Cor 3:17 cannot confirm any particular person or party.[38] So, I will consider three

[38] Indeed, τις could conceivably refer to different people in different instances even within 1 Cor 3. In 1 Cor 3:4 Paul claims that when *someone* (τις) says he or she is of Paul or Apollos, then the *Corinthians* are being "merely

other points of data to determine if reading 1 Cor 3:17 as a warning against the Corinthians makes better sense of Paul's argument than reading it as a threat against some teacher like Apollos. First, does Paul suggest in this letter that the apostles or teachers can harm the building through poor building, and does he intimate that the Corinthians can harm the congregation? Second, does Paul elsewhere threaten the teachers or the Corinthians in this letter? Third, does Paul talk about the other teachers as sources of danger or as enemies elsewhere in this letter? Answering these questions can help us determine if it makes contextual sense to read the target of Paul's warning of destruction in 1 Cor 3:17 as the teachers or as the Corinthians.

In 1 Cor 3:10–15, Paul discusses the work performed by the teachers who build on the foundation of Christ. He does describe the evaluation of their work, and does suggest that the teachers might build with materials of differing quality. The difference among these materials, however, is not tied to their potential to harm the building, but rather to the materials' ability to withstand fire in the day.[39] Absent is any hint that combustible material actually harms the community. On the other hand, Paul claims several times that the Corinthians can harm the congregation by their behaviour. The case of incest in 1 Cor 5, for example, is problematic precisely because it has potential to pollute the community as a whole. A little leaven, Paul says, leavens the whole lump of dough, and so the Corinthians are called to drive out the polluted person in order to protect the purity of the wider congregation (1 Cor 5:6–7). Similarly,

---

human" (οὐκ ἄνθρωποί ἐστε), and so here τις seems to refer to the Corinthians. On the other hand, in 1 Cor 3:12 τις refers to one building on the foundation of Christ, which seems to be a reference to Apollos or another teacher (a view I share with Goulder 1991, 519; Lang 1994, 52; Ker 2000, 89; and Smit 2002, 242).

[39] So Hollander 1994, 94–95. This reading makes the best sense of what Paul actually says about the material in 1 Cor 3:13–15, namely, that the kind of work one builds will be revealed and tested by fire with the result either that it burns up or does not. Numerous texts, Jewish and otherwise, speak of refining the former three materials or speak of the destruction by fire of the latter three. See Sir 2:5; Prov 10:20 LXX; Zech 12:6 LXX; Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 20.65.1.

Corinthian indiscretion concerning idol meat can harm members of the Corinthian congregation. Paul claims that if someone sees the one who has knowledge eating idol meat, the one who sees will be destroyed.[40] Since Paul does elsewhere suggest that the Corinthians can destroy the congregation, it is consistent to suppose that they are the ones who might destroy the temple in 1 Cor 3:16 and thus experience destruction in return.

Paul also does not threaten the other teachers, but he does threaten the Corinthians. Several scholars read βλέπω in 3:10 as if it marks a threat or warning aimed at the teachers,[41] but this is inconsistent with the ways in which NT writers otherwise use this word. In the NT, βλέπω certainly can be used in the imperative to mean "avoid" or "beware," but in such cases it either appears alone or followed by μη/μήποτε or by ἀπό.[42] Only in Luke 8:18 and Eph 5:15 is βλέπω paired with πῶς as it is in 1 Cor 3:10. In neither of these two passages is there a clear warning or threat. Instead, Luke issues a call to pay attention to how one listens because those who have will receive more, and those without will lose what they have.[43] In Ephesians the author urges care in how one lives, aiming to live as a wise person rather than an unwise person (Eph 5:15). Since βλέπω with πῶς does not signify a threat elsewhere in the NT, then we do not have to take it as a

[40] 1 Cor 8:11: "For by your knowledge, the one who is weak is destroyed" (my translation of ἀπόλλυται γὰρ ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἐν τῇ σῇ γνώσει).

[41] E.g., Williams 2001, 293, claims, "along with his statement that he laid the foundation stone in Corinth, Paul proclaims a warning against others who would build in a contrary manner. Paul states that each one must be careful how he builds. The future judgment is likely in mind here since Paul uses the imperative βλεπέτω." Cf. McKelvey 1969, 99; Fee 1987, 138; Kuck 1992, 171; Yinger 1999, 223; Garland 2003, 115.

[42] For βλέπω with ἀπό, consider Mark 8:15: βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρῴδου ("Beware the yeast of the Pharisees and of Herod"). For βλέπω with μή, see Luke 21:8: Βλέπετε μὴ πλανηθῆτε ("Beware lest you are deceived"). For βλέπω alone, see Phil 3:2: Βλέπετε τοὺς κύνας, βλέπετε τοὺς κακοὺς ἐργάτας, βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν ("Beware the dogs, beware the evil workers, beware the mutilators") [my translations]. See also, Matt 24:4; Mark 12:38, 13:5; Acts 13:40; 1 Cor 8:9, 10:12; Gal 5:15; Col 2:8; Heb 3:12, 12:25; 2 John 8.

[43] I am in agreement here with Marshall 1978, 330.

threat in 1 Cor 3:10 either unless there are contextual reasons for doing so. As it is, however, 1 Cor 3:15 ends with an affirmation that the one who builds improperly will still be saved, which seems to soften the call to caution in 1 Cor 3:10–14.

By contrast, Paul does explicitly threaten the Corinthians. Indeed, he does so in the very next chapter. In 1 Cor 4:18–21 he mentions the possibility of his future visit. In 1 Cor 4:21 he asks whether he should visit in a spirit of gentleness or with a rod (ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐν ἀγάπῃ πνεύματί τε πραΰτητος). This threat of harsh correction in 1 Cor 4:21 contrasts with the discussion of the teachers and the evaluation of their work in 1 Cor 3:5–15, which, by my reading of βλέπω in 1 Cor 3:10, seems not to threaten at all, but rather to remind them of God's role as arbiter over their work. In light of this, reading 1 Cor 3:17 as a threat against the Corinthians seems to fit with Paul's patterns elsewhere more readily than reading it as a threat against the teachers.

Finally, Paul talks about the other teachers as if they are faithful, not as if they are dangerous and in need of correction. In 1 Cor 3:5, Paul describes himself and Apollos as fellow διάκονοι. Andrew Clarke claims, "Paul deliberately plays down the role which the apostles fulfill: first, these leaders are to be considered no more than servants who function under the Lord; and secondly, the focus is not on who they are, but rather on what their task is."[44] While this is true and in keeping with the thrust of 1 Cor 3:5–15, we should also note that the διάκονος of God is not a position that Paul denigrates, but an honourable position.[45] The task of the διάκονος in 1 Cor

[44] Clarke 2006, 119. Cf. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 145, who claim the use of the word διάκονοι deflates the teachers' status to "only servants."

[45] Indeed, in 2 Cor 3:5–6 Paul stresses that God made him to be a minister of a new covenant (διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης) precisely in order to demonstrate the source of his confidence towards God. See also Rom 16:1; 2 Cor 6:4, 11:23; Phil 1:1.

3:5 comes directly from God himself (ἑκάστῳ ὡς ὁ κύριος ἔδωκεν). Apollos is described as one who shares in the κόπος prescribed by God in 1 Cor 3:8.[46] He is moreover considered to be a fellow worker along with Paul in 1 Cor 3:9. When one considers this description of the other teachers as faithful, yet under the authority of God, it is hard to understand why Paul would so suddenly invoke God's wrath against them for destroying the temple only a few verses later.

In light of the above data points, I maintain that reading 1 Cor 3:17 as a threat against the Corinthians makes better sense of the letter's broader context than reading it as a threat against the teachers. I showed that Paul sees the Corinthians' behaviours, not the teachers' behaviours, as potentially harmful to the community; that he elsewhere threatens the Corinthians, not the teachers; and that he sees the teachers as faithful servants of God. If Paul is addressing the Corinthians in 1 Cor 3:17, and if they are the ones who can potentially destroy the temple, we must still ask how Paul suggests they might do so, as this will impact how we understand the appeal to the temple in Paul's argument.

4.3.2 – Temple Destruction Through Division

Pauline scholars have offered various interpretations as to what destroys the temple in 1 Cor 3:17. Some scholars make broad claims about temple destruction by suggesting that one destroys the temple by robbing the Corinthians of "grace and peace."[47] This reading depends on the use of φθείρω in 2 Cor 7:2 and 11:3. Other scholars tie temple destruction to poor building and ministry

[46] Κόπος is often used as a badge of honour in Paul (2 Cor 6:5, 11:23, 11:27) and as a way to label his work in a given community (1 Thess 1:3, 2:9, 3:5). It would be odd to use this label of Apollos's work if he found Apollos's work so poor that it could actually destroy the community.

[47] Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 161. Cf. Witherington 1995, 134, who says one destroys the Corinthian temple by "harming the Corinthian Christians spiritually, emotionally, mentally, or physically."

practices.[48] These readings generally require the evaluation of one's building (the topic in 1 Cor 3:10–15) to remain central even in 1 Cor 3:17, which I have argued in the previous section is not the case. Moreover, these readings often depend on the further belief that the teachers are implicated in the warning in 1 Cor 3:17, a belief which I argued is unlikely given the broader context of 1 Corinthians. We may ask, however, whether we can we be still more specific in our understanding of the behaviour that destroys the temple in light of the above proposal to take 1 Cor 3:16–17 as a distinct section from 1 Cor 3:5–15. While the word φθείρω does not, by itself, tell us the means by which destruction happens, we can attempt to constrain the possible range of meanings by paying attention to the wider context of 1 Cor 1:10—4:21, as well as the more immediate context of 1 Cor 3.

In the wider context of 1 Cor 1:10–4:21, the Corinthians' divisive behaviour is the primary concern.[49] The concern for division is immediately evident in 1 Cor 1:10. This verse opens with a positive appeal to unity, but this exhortation is rooted in Paul's belief that the Corinthians are, in actual fact, schismatic. Paul says, "I appeal to you . . . that all of you be in agreement and that there be no divisions among you, but that you be united in the same mind and the same purpose," Paul then provides the reason for this appeal in 1 Cor 1:11: "For (γάρ) it has

[48] Hollander 1994, 103; Yinger 1999, 224; Wardle 2010, 212; Bitner 2015b, 273. Mihaila 2009, 37, also appears to read temple destruction in terms of poor building and ministry practices when he says 1 Cor 3:17 "carries forward the warning of watchfulness in regard to the quality of ministry found in the previous image" and that the sternness of the warning is due to Paul's focus on the "negative result of a ministry done for reasons of gaining honor and status." Later, however, he says the Corinthians are "in danger of being 'destroyed' because of their factionalism" (Mihaila 2009, 39).

[49] I take these verses to comprise a major unit in this letter. There can, of course, be slight differences in the ways scholars divide these sections. E.g., Mitchell 1993, and Witherington 1995, treat the introductory material in 1 Cor 1:10–17 separately from the argumentative section in 1 Cor 1:18—4:21. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, almost uniquely, conclude the unit at 1 Cor 4:17 rather than 1 Cor 4:21. In any case, however, most scholars see a great deal of unity in the first four chapters. Cf. Hays 1997; Barrett 1971; Bruce 1971.

been reported to me by Chloe's people that there are quarrels among you." This division among the Corinthians sets the stage for the following chapters.

The arguments that unfold following 1 Cor 1:11 continually circle back to the underlying issue of division. The discussion of human versus divine wisdom, for example, does not occur for its own sake, but rather provides foundational information from which Paul builds additional points in his case against division. Here, Paul says he speaks wisdom to the mature (1 Cor 2:6) and further builds that statement into a more general contrast between the "spiritual" (πνευματικός) and "human" (σάρκινος) (1 Cor 3:1).This then culminates in the claim that the Corinthians actually cannot receive wisdom because they are divisive (1 Cor 3:3–4).[50] Thus, while engaging the peripheral issue of wisdom, he returns to his primary focus, the Corinthians' division. Similarly, in 1 Cor 4, Paul discusses the ministry of himself and Apollos, noting again that they are ultimately accountable to God, who will judge in "the time" (καιρός) (1 Cor 4:5).[51] But, the ultimate purpose for this discussion appears in 1 Cor 4:6: "I have applied all this to Apollos and myself . . . so that none of you will be puffed up in favor of one against another." Here too, Paul brings the discussion back to the topic of the Corinthians' division, and clarifies that preventing this division is the key rationale for his argument. In light of this wider context, with its continual emphasis on Corinthian division, it seems likely that a threat telling the Corinthians not to destroy the temple would also, in some sense, push against this divisive behaviour.

[50] "For you are still of the flesh. For as long as there is jealousy and quarrelling among you, are you not of the flesh, and behaving according to human inclinations? For when one says, 'I belong to Paul,' and another, 'I belong to Apollos,' are you not merely human?"

[51] Cf. 1 Cor 3:5–15 and the emphasis there on the coming evaluation of the teachers on "the day."

The more immediate context of 1 Cor 3 also stresses the Corinthians' division. I already demonstrated that 1 Cor 3 is bracketed by appeals not to divide into factions led by human leaders. In 1 Cor 3:1–4, Paul addresses the Corinthians as "merely human" (1 Cor 3:4) due to their divisions. In 1 Cor 3:18–23, Paul urges the Corinthians not to boast in human beings because all is theirs and they are Christ's and Christ is God's. Because the chapter is bracketed by attacks on division, and because the Corinthians are critiqued in 1 Cor 3 in relation to the issue of division, it would seem odd for Paul to urge them not to destroy the temple, which they are, through something as general as "harming the Corinthian Christians spiritually, emotionally, mentally, or physically."[52] Instead, supposing that Paul is presenting division as the cause of temple destruction makes better contextual sense and thus suggests that a threat directed them in this chapter would most naturally serve to discourage their division.

4.3.3 – Conclusions Concerning Who Destroys the Temple and How

I began this section by asking if 1 Cor 3:16–17 continues the topic of teachers and the evaluation of their work found in 1 Cor 3:5–15, and suggested that at 1 Cor 3:16–17 we find a shift in Paul's argument. I made this case by consideration of 1 Cor 3:5–15 in the context of chapter 3, and in comparison with 1 Cor 3:16–17. I concluded that if 1 Cor 3:5–15 and 1 Cor 3:16–17 are not about the same thing, then 1 Cor 3:16–17 might not be directed at the teachers who build on the foundation of Christ. I then asked if the warning of 1 Cor 3:17 is directed at the teachers or the Corinthians. I did so by considering the ways Paul talks to (and about) the teachers and the Corinthians throughout 1 Corinthians, and I determined that reading the threat in 1 Cor 3:17 as a threat directed at the Corinthians made better sense of the letter's wider content. Finally, I

[52] Witherington 1995, 134.

considered what behaviour could destroy the temple. I answered this question by examining the shape of 1 Cor 1:10—4:21, as well as the more local context of 1 Cor 3. I found that Corinthian division is the primary problem addressed in these sections. So, the threat in 1 Cor 3:17 most likely attacks that behaviour.

I conclude, based on the above data, that in 1 Cor 3:16–17 Paul is pushing against Corinthian division by reinterpreting it as something that can destroy the temple that they are. In what manner does he present such destruction, and why is fear of destroying a temple something that could be compelling to the Corinthians and cause them to unite? Answering these questions requires a close look at the discussion of temple destruction in 1 Cor 3:16–17, as well as Paul's more general discussion of division and its consequences. I will do this in the next section, where I will consider questions of resonance between Paul's argument and major metaphysical pollution, beginning with the issue of whether Paul presents temple destruction as sacrilege.

4.4 – Destroying the Temple and Sacrilege

I have presented my understanding of how 1 Cor 3:16–17 fits in its context, towards whom it is directed, and what behaviour can destroy the temple. With these established we can begin to ask more specifically if 1 Cor 3:16–17 resonates with discussions of sacrilege that follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution. We can do this by looking at the cause, effect, and resolution of temple destruction in 1 Cor 3:16–17. If the way Paul presents temple destruction and destruction against the destroyer(s) parallels patterns found in other ancient literature, then he may be drawing on concepts of sacrilege and pollution common in the ancient Greco-Roman world. The first step, then, is to study the way Paul talks about temple destruction. Does he do so in a way that hints the act of temple destruction should be understood as an act of sacrilege?

There is influential scholarship that looks at Paul's description of temple destruction within its ancient Greco-Roman context by comparing 1 Cor 3:17 with Greek temple-building contracts. This type of scholarship is exemplified by the work of Jay Shanor.[53] In his brief article, he compares 1 Cor 3:9b–17 with a 4th century Greek inscription containing conditions for contractors and workmen laboring on the temple of Athena. He highlights several terms in the inscription that match or are similar to words in 1 Cor 3, namely: ἔργον, ζαμιόω, and φθήρω (φθείρω). He relies on this shared vocabulary, used in the similar context of temple building, in order 1) to determine who the other builder is who builds on the foundation in 1 Cor 3:10, 2) to consider the nature of the material used in 1 Cor 3:10–15, 3) to clarify the nature of the rewards and losses in 1 Cor 3:10–15, and 4) to define the nature of destruction of the temple. It is this last point that is most critical for my thesis.[54] Shanor believes the destruction of the temple in 1 Cor 3:17 is presented in a way that is analagous to the kind of damage a builder would sometimes inflict on a temple under construction.

Shanor's work is picked up by a number of other scholars who similarly see value in the construction context and shared vocabulary of the Greek temple building inscription. Lanci's monograph on Paul's temple imagery cites Shanor and sees temple destruction as "what might

[53] Shanor 1988.

[54] The most relevant sections of the inscription he cites read: "If anyone should oppose the allotment of the *jobs* (ἔργων), or should do harm, *doing damage* (ἐφθορκώς) in any way, *let* those who made the allotments *fine* (ζαμιόντω) him, whatever *fines* (ζαμίαι) seem right to them, and let them publicly announce it as their determination and summon him into the presiding court for the full sum of the *fine* (ζαμίαυ) . . . If anyone, having signed a contract, should damage any other of the existing *works* (ἔργων), whether sacred, public or private, contrary to the agreement of the contract, let him restore the part that was damaged at his own expense (to a condition) not inferior to what it was at the time of the contract. If he does not restore it, let him pay the *fines* (ἐπιζάμια), in keeping with those established for those *jobs* (ἔργοις) which have run past (the appointed time)." See Shanor 1988, 462. He pulls this inscription from Buck 1955, 201–3.

happen to a building under construction."[55] He believes that, "It is most likely that people on a construction site are liable to fines not for destroying work, but for inadvertently damaging the work of earlier laborers."[56] More recently, Bitner also sees temple destruction in 1 Cor 3:17 in terms of Greek building stipulations and penalties for violating them.[57]

All of these scholars are right to note the resonance between Paul's terminology in 1 Cor 3:9–17 and Greek building contracts, but is that the best context for understanding temple destruction here, or is sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution a better fit? Four areas deserve further exploration. First, what is the range of meaning for φθείρω? While φθείρω is used in temple building contracts to indicate destruction of a building under construction, is it also used in ways that could indicate sacrilege? Second, Paul grounds the retribution that afflicts the temple destroyer in terms of the temple's holiness, so we should ask whether that affects the way we understand its destruction. Third, the temple is presented not merely as a building being built, but also as the place in which the Spirit dwells presently. The Spirit's presence (or the gods' presence) is not at stake in these temple building contracts, which could mean that these contracts are talking about the danger of temple destruction in a different register. Fourth, Paul treats division (which, according to my reading, destroys the temple) in other places in 1 Corinthians. What he says about the dangers of division in other places could inform our understanding of its significance here.

---

[55] Lanci 1997, 67.

[56] Lanci 1997, 68.

[57] Bitner 2015b, 255. In addition to Shanor 1988, Bitner also cites Eger 1918 and 1919. Bitner also interacts with some inscriptions that Shanor does not, such as IG VII 3073.

See also, Weissenrieder 2012, 410 n. 108, who appears to adopt a hybrid approach to the issue of temple destruction as damage to a building under construction. On the one hand, she affirms Shanor's point, "that the word [φθείρω] refers to a damage done to a building under construction [sic.]." On the other hand, she also cites Lim 2010, 201 approvingly, who states that an act of destruction against God's temple is an act of sacrilege.

4.4.1 – Φθείρω and Desecrating the Sacred

In addition to its use to mean "destroy," φθείρω also carries a connotation of pollution, ruination, and corruption.[58] In some texts, the word refers to decay caused by disease, such as when Plutarch uses it to discuss a man with a disease that corrupts (φθείρω) his body and infects his various utensils with pollution (φθορά).[59] In several texts the word is used to refer to rape or seduction.[60] More significantly for this thesis, φθείρω is sometimes used precisely to indicate the pollution of an object such that it becomes incompatible with the sacred. This is the case in Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.* 109, in which Plutarch explains why the priests of Jupiter are not allowed to touch yeast (ζύμη). It is because yeast pollutes (φθείρω) the lump of dough with which it is mixed.

The use of this word to indicate pollution of the sacred is significant for this thesis because pollution of the sacred is commonly considered sacrilege and it often leads to major metaphysical pollution. The precise form that this pollution takes may, of course, vary. For example, in some texts sex pollutes a temple,[61] while in others corpse impurity does,[62] and in still others bloodshed pollutes a temple.[63] Regardless of the specifics, however, temple pollution is

---

[58] See the discussion in Harder 1964, "φθείρω κτλ," TDNT 9:93–106. Robertson and Plummer 1950, 67, also note the potential for φθείρω to mean corruption.

[59] This point is made by Liu 2013, 122, in reference to Plutarch, *Sull* 36.2–4.

[60] Josephus, *Ant.* 1.337 says Sychem rapes (φθείρω) Dinah. In Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 5.62.1–3, the word is used similarly, but more mildly, to refer to seduction.

[61] Pausanias, *Descr.* 7.19.3–6.

[62] Plutarch, *Dem.* 29.6.

[63] This is seen perhaps most clearly in Josephus. In *J.W.* 4.150 he says the brigands pollute the temple by invading it with bloodstained hands and polluted feet (μεμιασμένοις τοῖς ποσὶ).

usually considered sacrilege. If φθείρω is read as an act of pollution against the temple in 1 Cor 3:17, then it could be considered an act of sacrilege that causes major metaphysical pollution.

The fact that φθείρω *can* indicate pollution does not prove that the temple destruction described in 1 Cor 3:17 is sacrilege, but it makes it possible that it could be so. In order to determine whether Paul is presenting temple destruction as sacrilege, I will also need to consider contextual factors, both in the particular text of 1 Cor 3:16–17, and also in the wider context of Paul's discussion of division and its consequences throughout the letter. With this in mind, I now turn to the immediate context of 1 Cor 3:17 and address the issue of temple holiness.

4.4.2 – Temple Destruction as a Threat Against the Temple's Holiness

Paul grounds the warning of judgement against the temple destroyer in the temple's holiness. Paul gives his warning in 1 Cor 3:17 in the form of a conditional sentence: εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός, but he then goes on in the very next clause to identify precisely why this is the case. It is because (γάρ) the temple of God is holy (ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν). In the Greek building contracts cited by Shanor and others, the penalty associated with poor labour is *not* tied to the fact that the building under construction is holy. In IG VII 3073 (treated by Bitner) for example, penalties for poor building or damage to the construction project are due to failure to comply with the written regulations for construction.[64] In the contract cited by Shanor, it is stated explicitly that the penalties one endures for damaging the temple are not related to the sanctity of the temple. The relevant portion of the contact reads: "If anyone, having signed a

[64] Lines 15–21 read: "If in some way he [contractor] does not comply with the things written in the specifications or should be convicted of bad practice in some way, he will be fined by the *naopoioi* according to whatever he seems to deserve (for) not doing the things written in the specifications, and if anyone else of the co workers is convicted of bad practice in any respect, let him be driven out of the job and no longer work with the others; if he does not comply, he too will be fined along with the contractor." Translation from Bitner 2015b, 221.

contract, should damage any other of the existing *works* (ἔργων), *whether sacred, public or private*, contrary to the agreement of the contract, let him restore the part that was damaged at his own expense."[65] Grounding penalties in the temple's holiness also makes it more likely that φθείρω is used to indicate temple pollution, since it is often the pollution of holy or sacred objects that leads to judgement. This critical difference in the rationale for judgement suggests that Paul is not presenting the Corinthians' division merely in terms of damage to a temple building project in process,[66] but is rather presenting the Corinthians' division as an act of sacrilege.

This reading becomes more plausible in light of other texts in which sacrilege leads to judgement because the temple under assault is holy. Pausanias relates several stories about the various impious crimes performed against the temple of the Cabeiri.[67] Some men perform an improper ritual, and are subsequently overtaken by justice. Others enter the temple in order to show contempt to the gods (ἢ ἐς τὸ θεῖον ὀλιγωρίᾳ). These are struck by madness. At another time, enemy soldiers enter the temple and are destroyed (φθείρω) by thunder and lightning from heaven. Pausanias explains the need for judgement against these acts of impiety by appeal precisely to the temple's holiness.[68] He concludes: "So sacred [ἅγιος] this sanctuary has been

[65] Shanor 1988, 462 (emphasis mine).

[66] Which could actually occur inadvertently during the course of one's labour according to Lanci 1997, 68.

[67] Pausanias, *Descr.* 9.25.9–10, a passage which opens this thesis.

[68] Some recent scholarship claims ἅγιος was not a feature of Greco-Roman pagan temples. For example, Harrington 2019, 327, says, "ἅγιος does not refer to sanctity in Greek religion." Similarly, Brower 2009, 60, claims, "Temples are sacred sites but no one except the Jews thinks of them in terms of holiness." While these scholars are right to tease out the distinctions between Jewish and Greek understandings of holiness and temples, it is incorrect to say that Greek-speaking Gentiles did not use ἅγιος to refer to temples, or to suggest that holiness was irrelevant in the Greco-Roman world outside of Judaism and early Christianity. For temples identified clearly as ἅγιος in Greco-Roman pagan Literature, see Plato, *Critias* 116; Aelian, *Historical Miscellany* 1.15; Pausanias, *Descr*. 3.23.1; 4.34.11, 9.26.1, 10.32.13; Demosthenes, *Neaer.* 76; Strabo, *Geogr*. 9.5.14, 16.3.2. Williger 1922, also provides a much older, but more comprehensive discussion of ἅγιος in texts outside of the Bible.

from the beginning."[69] In this text, explaining that the temple is holy provides the rationale behind the judgement that afflicts the sacrilegious.

These data make it possible, in terms of the language and shape of 1 Cor 3:16–17, that Paul is presenting temple destruction in terms of sacrilege. Φθείρω could indicate temple pollution, which is frequently linked to sacrilege. Paul also deviates from the Greek building contracts by linking the necessity of judgement to the temple's holiness. By doing so, he suggests that judgement is required because temple destruction is a violation of sacred space, which can constitute an act of sacrilege. This sacred space is also the present dwelling place of the Spirit, so we must now ask whether this could shift our understanding of temple destruction.

4.4.3 – Temple Destruction Through Division as Offence Against the Spirit

In 1 Cor 3:16, Paul introduces two propositions. The first is that the Corinthians are the temple of God. The second, is that the Spirit of God dwells in them. The importance of the Spirit's indwelling is made even clearer by the fact that Paul repeats that point again in 1 Cor 6:19: "Your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God" (τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός ἐστιν οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ). By mentioning explicitly that the temple is the dwelling place of the Spirit, Paul clarifies what is at stake when one threatens the temple with destruction: the temple destroyer destroys the very place of divine presence!

The seriousness of destroying the temple in which the Spirit dwells is heightened still further because division "cuts across the grain" of the Spirit's nature and function in 1 Corinthians and elsewhere in the Pauline epistles.[70] In 1 Corinthians alone, the Spirit performs a

[69] Pausanias, *Descr.* 9.26.1 (Οὕτω μὲν τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦτό ἐστιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἅγιον).

[70] Levison 2006, 201.

number of critical functions related to the unity of the Corinthian congregation. For example, the Corinthians share in their reception of the Spirit of God (1 Cor 2:12). All were baptised by one Spirit into the one body of Christ (ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν)[71] and all drink from this one Spirit (πάντες ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν) regardless of ethinc origin (1 Cor 12:13). It is true that the Spirit gives a variety of spiritual gifts,[72] but Paul stresses in 1 Cor 12:4 that all these gifts derive from the same Spirit (τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα) and goes on to show how all these gifts support the one body (see esp. 1 Cor 12:27–31). The Spirit's role in creating and maintaining the unity of the Corinthian church means that the Corinthians' division destroys the dwelling place of the one who unified them in the first place.[73]

The fact that Paul explicitly notes the Spirit's indwelling presence in the temple that is under threat, combined with the fact that division pushes directly against the Spirit's unifying work in 1 Corinthians, makes it possible that when Paul talks about destruction of the temple, he is thinking of that destruction in terms of sacrilege. There is still one other area to consider, namely, the way in which Paul describes the effects of division elsewhere in the letter. This could affect the way we read the significance of temple destruction (through division) in 1 Cor 3:17.

---

[71] Cf. 1 Cor 6:11 in which all were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and also in the Spirit of God.

[72] Fee 1994, 159, argues, "Diversity, not uniformity, is the essential matter for a healthy church." He is certainly correct to note that Paul provides for diversity in the matter of spiritual gifts in 1 Cor 12–14, and so I am not disagreeing with him here. I want to emphasise, however, that even granting for diversity in the expression of spiritual gifts, we should note Paul's focus on the unity of the Spirit that provides the gifts and the unity of the church body that exercises them.

[73] The idea that the spirit provides unifying power has parallels in other ancient literature. Cicero, for example, says the world is held together by a "single divine and all-pervading spirit," (Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.19). Plutarch notes the Stoic belief that earth and water are united because they participate in "pneumatic and fiery power" (πνευματικῆς δὲ μετοχῆ καὶ πυρώδους δυνάμεως) (Plutarch, *Comm. Not.* 1085D). Levison 2009, 293, notes the Stoic view of πνεῦμα as the thing that holds the universe together in his discussion of 1 Cor 3:16–17. See also his discussion of πνεῦμα in the Stoics on pages 137–42.

4.4.4 – Division as Offence Against Christ

Paul's first point of rebuttal against the Corinthians' division is an argument that division divides the body of Christ himself. Paul makes this point in 1 Cor 1:13 where he states: μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός.[74] Several commentators read this verse as if it is saying some Corinthians thought they were uniquely apportioned a part of Christ over and against their fellow Christians. George G. Findlay, writing over a century ago, suggests, "the Christian who asserts 'I am Christ's' in distinction from others, claims an *exclusive* part in him."[75] Many other scholars take a similar position. For example, Gordon Fee reads the verse as saying, "Has Christ been distributed/apportioned out as one among many?"[76] Anthony Thiselton cites with agreement Robertson and Plummer's contention: "the probable meaning of μεμέρισται is 'has Christ been apportioned?,' i.e., given to someone as his separate share."[77] There are two items to consider, however, before accepting this reading. The first is whether taking μερίζω to mean "apportioned" makes the best sense of the way this word is used in NT texts and in the rest of 1 Corinthians. The other is the broader issue of dividing gods in the ancient world. Is there precedent for such an act, and if so, does the act parallel the discussion in 1 Cor 1? The conclusions we reach in these areas have implications for the way we read Paul's presentation of temple destruction through division in 1 Cor 3:17.

---

[74] So N.T. Wright 2013b, 291, who notes that Paul addresses unity "right from the start in 1 Corinthians, with his sharp question to factionalism: *memeristai ho Christos*?" and then goes on to note how this idea, presented early on in the epistle, influences a great deal of the remaining letter. Similarly, in his discussion of 1 Cor 3:17, Levison 2006, 191, claims the Corinthians are failing to "appreciate and to appropriate the unifying presence of Christ in their midst," but he does not mention 1 Cor 1:13, specifically, here.

[75] Findlay 1897, 2:765 (italics original).

[76] Fee 1987, 60.

[77] Thiselton 2000, 136, citing Robertson and Plummer 1950, 13. Other scholars who take a similar position include Barrett 1971, 46; Hays 1997, 23; and Lindemann 2000, 41.

Μερίζω appears only fourteen times in the New Testament.[78] In many cases, the word clearly has a distributive sense. In Mark 6:41, μερίζω is used in the story of Jesus' miraculous feeding of the 5,000. Here, the evangelist states that Jesus τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν. In the next verse, the people are said to have eaten their fill (Mark 6:42) and so it seems the fish must have been distributed to them rather than simply split apart. Several other passages in the NT seem to refer to distribution with equal clarity,[79] but in each of these texts, μερίζω appears in the active voice. In texts where is used in the passive voice, it seems more natural to read it as meaning "divide/separate into parts." For example, Matt 12:25–26 and Mark 3:24–26 speak of the impotence of a kingdom divided (μερίζω) against itself. Since the idea here is that Satan could not stand if he turned against himself, reading μερίζω as division makes much better sense than supposing Jesus is talking about Satan being "apportioned" (to whom?) against himself.[80]

The wider context of 1 Corinthians makes reading μερίζω as a splitting apart of Christ through Corinthian division more plausible. This is due to the close relationship between the Corinthians (as a body) and Christ's body elsewhere in the letter. Most prominently, this relationship is described in 1 Cor 12:12–31. Here, ὁ Χριστός (cf. 1 Cor 1:13) is compared with a body, which has many discernible members, but which nonetheless constitutes a cohesive whole (1 Cor 12:12).[81] What is more, the things that happen to individual members of this body are said

[78] In Matt 12:25–26; Mark 3:24–26, 6:41; Luke 12:13; Rom 12:3; 1 Cor 1:13, 7:17, 7:34; 2 Cor 10:13; Heb 7:2.

[79] See Rom 12:3; 1 Cor 7:17; 2 Cor 10:13; Heb 7:2.

[80] For other examples of μερίζω in the passive voice used to refer to division or splitting apart, see 1 Cor 7:34; 2 Cor 10:13; Heb 7:2.

[81] There are a number of scholars that make a connection between 1 Cor 1:13 and the body of Christ metaphor, starting at least as early as Weiss 1925. Conzelmann 1975, 35, says of 1 Cor 1:13: "The simplest way of understanding the expression and the argument is to presuppose the view of the church as the body of Christ."

to impact the corporate body so that, "if one member suffers, all suffer together with it" and "if one member is honored, all rejoice together with it" (1 Cor 12:26). If all the members of the Corinthian church are also members of ὁ Χριστός, and if the things that happen to one member affect the others as well, then it seems plausible that Paul would see the rending of this church as an act that would also rend Christ himself.

The other item to consider is the broader issue of dividing gods in the ancient world. Dividing or rending the images of the gods is frequently considered an act of sacrilege.[82] Artemidorus, to list one example, decries the dangers of image mutilation and links it with other acts of sacrilege when he writes, "And to destroy the statues of gods and cast them out of the house in which they are enshrined and rip down a temple or perform something unholy in a temple is grievous for all and signifies great crises."[83] In Appian's writings, this kind of sacrilegious image mutilation is even indicated using μερίζω. He relates a story in which troops enter the temple of Apollo and, upon finding the image (ἄγαλμα) of the god there, they cut it apart with daggers (ἐσύλων καὶ ταῖς μαχαίραις ἔκοπτον) and divide it (ἐμερίσαντο) to carry off as plunder.[84] Texts like these establish that when Paul speaks of the Corinthians' actions "dividing" Christ through division, he is using language consistent with discussions of sacrilege that follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution.

Schrage 1991, 1:152, also sees a connection here and argues that the presence of ὁ Χριστός in 1 Cor 1:13 proves this connection.

[82] See, e.g., the more detailed discussion in Parker 1983, 168–70. It was accusations of image defacement that led to the impiety trials of 415 detailed in Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War* 6; Plutarch, *Alc.*; and Andocides, *On the Mysteries*.

[83] Artemidorus, *Oneir.* 2.33.

[84] Appian, *Roman History* 8.1.127.

I showed here that μερίζω in the passive indicates division or splitting apart in the NT. The appearance of the body of Christ metaphor in 1 Corinthians also suggests that Paul sees the Corinthians' division as something that divides Christ. I then highlighted that this language of dividing the deity finds parallel in other ancient literature in which dividing the images of the gods constitutes an act of sacrilege. The fact that Paul presents division in terms compatible with sacrilege in 1 Cor 1:13 does not prove that temple destruction in 1 Cor 3:16–17 is sacrilege. However, it adds one more point of plausibility to that reading because it establishes that in one other text in 1 Corinthians Paul describes division (which I take to be what destroys the temple) in terms reminiscent of discussions of sacrilege that follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution.

4.4.5 – Conclusion: Destroying the Temple and Sacrilege

In this section, I asked if temple destruction in 1 Cor 3:16–17 is presented as sacrilege. I began by examining φθείρω and showed that it could be used to indicate the desecration of the sacred, something that frequently constitutes sacrilege. Next, I showed that temple destruction leads to judgement in 1 Cor 3:17 because it is a crime against something holy, and this is consistent with other texts in which acts of temple sacrilege meet with judgement because a temple is holy. I then contended that destroying the temple through division desecrates the dwelling of the Spirit and cuts against his unifying work, which hints that Paul is presenting temple destruction as a sacrilegious offence. Finally, I noted that in 1 Cor 1:13 Paul presents Corinthian division as if it has potential to divide Christ's body, and dividing images of the gods is commonly treated as sacrilege. This means it is possible that Paul could also view destruction of the temple through division as a kind of sacrilege. I conclude, with these data in mind, that Paul does not present

temple destruction in terms strictly analogous to damage done by builders or contractors to a building under construction, but rather presents it as a sacrilegious offence.

Presenting an act in terms of sacrilege is done frequently in ancient literature to activate the logic of major metaphysical pollution. If Paul is doing the same thing, then we would expect to see effects and means of resolution that also cohere with this system of pollution. In the next section I will begin to discuss these topics and consider how Paul presents the conseqences of temple destruction.

4.5 – The Effects of Temple Destruction and the Loss of the Spirit

I noted in chapter 2 that a chief difference between the logic of major metaphysical pollution and the logic of temple pollution in the OT has to do with the presence of the gods. In major metaphysical pollution, sacrilege *can* lead to the loss of the gods' presence, but this is not consistent in all cases. In the OT, however, the loss of God's presence due to acumulated pollution caused by the sins (especially idolatry) of Israel is a constant concern. Many Pauline scholars argue that temple destruction in 1 Cor 3:17 should be understood as something that drives out God's Spirit. Some seem to base this view precisely on the relationship between moral pollution and the loss of God's presence in the temple in the OT, which they see as relevant for 1 Corinthians because of Paul's Jewish identity and frequent use of the OT in other contexts. For example, Michael Newton says Paul believed in the transfer of the *Shekinah* from the Jerusalem temple to the Corinthian community.[85] So, "God dwells with the community of Christian believers which is made up of those who have been washed, sanctified and justified (1 Cor. 6:11). Only thus purified can they enter the Temple of God and offer their bodies as a living

[85] Newton 1985, 59.

sacrifice."[86] This leads him to believe that the new believers, in a manner analogous to the people of Israel in the OT, must "conduct themselves in such a manner as to enable God's presence to remain with them."[87] Similarly, Cecilia Wassen, speaking of the temple image, concludes that, "the believers, purified through baptism, must now preserve their purity by living righteously, in order that God's presence may remain within the community (e.g., Phil 2:14–16; 'without blemish')."[88] These readings assume that Paul applies OT concepts of moral pollution and its impact on God's presence in the Jerusalem temple to the Corinthians who have now become a temple.

While it is certainly possible that Paul's temple imagery fits into this OT pollution framework, I have shown that other Jews in the first century frequently read the OT and discussed the destruction of the Jerusalem temple through the lens of major metaphysical pollution, without, apparently, perceiving any conflict between these systems. With this in mind, there is need to examine what Paul says in 1 Cor 3:16–17 without assuming readings that follow the logic of moral pollution in the OT are the only historically plausible readings. I will do this in three steps. First, I will survey Paul's descriptions of the Spirit's indwelling across his letters and ask if and how he says believers can lose or drive away the Spirit. This will help us determine whether the loss of the Spirit is likely to be at stake in the specific instance of community division. Second, I will consider 1 Cor 5:5 and engage some recent scholarship that says the pollution caused by the incestuous man does not threaten the man's spirit, but threatens to drive

[86] Newton 1985, 59.

[87] Newton 1985, 59.

[88] Wassen 2013, 78. Cf. Robertson and Plummer 1950, 66.

out God's Spirit. Third, I will highlight what Paul actually says will happen after temple destruction in 1 Cor 3:17.

4.5.1 – Paul's Language for the Spirit's Presence

Dealing first with the issue of the Spirit's indwelling in Paul's letters, broadly speaking, I note that while Paul discusses the Spirit frequently, he tends to emphasise its presence, not the possibility of its absence. In several passages, he talks about believers receiving the Spirit. In these texts, he often use λαμβάνω to indicate the believer's act of reception.[89] In other texts, he discusses the stative nature of the Spirit within the believer once it has been received. This is true, of course, of 1 Cor 3:16, but also in Rom 8:9 and 8:11. In both of these latter texts, Paul says the Spirit dwells (οἰκέω/ἐνοικέω) in the believers. In other texts, he focuses not on the believers and their reception of the Spirit, but on God and his distribution of the Spirit. In these passages, Paul says that God sends (ἐξαποστέλλω) the Spirit into "our hearts" (Gal 4:6), gives (δίδωμι) the Spirit to us (2 Cor 5:5), or gives (δίδωμι) the Spirit to you (1 Thess 4:8). Paul does not, in these texts, describe the inverse of these propositions. That is, Paul does not speak of the believers returning the Spirit to God, nor does he indicate that the Spirit will some day stop dwelling in the believers, nor does he hint that God will take the Spirit back from the believers at some point. This is true even in Rom 3:4, where he cites Pss 50 LXX. The Psalm does describe the potential to lose God's Holy Spirit following sin, and yet in Paul's quotation of it, there is no mention of this possibility.[90] What is more, in 1 Thess 5:19 and Eph 4:30 Paul pushes against

[89] See Rom 8:15; 1 Cor 2:12; Gal 3:2.

[90] Paul cites Pss 50:6 LXX: ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου, καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε. In Pss 50:13 LXX the psalmist says: μὴ ἀποῤῥίψῃς με ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον μὴ ἀντανέλῃς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

behaviour that can "quench" or "grieve" the spirit,[91] but in neither text does he suggest that these offensive acts expel the spirit, and indeed, in Eph 4:30 he even follows this command with a statement that the spirit is a seal on the believer.[92]

Since Paul's common pattern is to discuss the presence of the Spirit without describing its loss, we should be cautious about reading the loss of the Spirit into 1 Cor 3:17 without strong contextual reasons for doing so. But are there other passages in Paul's letter in which his argument assumes that the spirit can be expelled through sin? I will address this question in the next section.

4.5.2 – The Spirit in 1 Cor 5:5

In 1 Cor 5:5, Paul says, concerning an incestuous man, "you are to hand this man over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, so that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord." This passage is often read as if the man will face physical consequences for his actions, which are ultimately for his benefit, and then he will be saved. Recently, however, Suh offers a strong argument that the spirit in 1 Cor 5:5 is not the spirit of the incestuous man, saved in the day of the Lord, but rather the Holy Spirit, which must be preserved through the expulsion of the sinful man.[93] He adopts this position for three reasons. First, he argues that, apart from Origen who sees the spirit in 1 Cor 5:5 as the man's spirit, many other patristic exegetes read the spirit as the Holy Spirit. Second, He claims that Paul rarely uses τὸ πνεῦμα without qualification to describe anything other than the Holy Spirit and that he *only* uses the nominative articular, τὸ πνεῦμα, to

[91] Paul uses the words σβέννυμι and λυπέω respectively here.

[92] Cf. 2 Cor 1:22. Against Ambrosiaster, *In Epistulas ad Corinthios I* 5:5, who argues that to grieve the Spirit is precisely to drive him away.

[93] Suh 2020, 58–77. Suh is not the first to make this suggestion. Cf. Campbell 1993, 341; Collins 1980, 263; DeMaris 2008, 48.

refer to the Holy Spirit. Third, he suggests that the wider context of 1 Cor 5, with its concern for the health of the community and no discussion of repentance, supports his reading. There are issues with his argument, however, that render it less than compelling. I will deal with these first and then provide counter points to the effect that the spirit in 1 Cor 5:5 is the man's spirit.

Suh's first point concerning the church fathers is valuable because it corrects previous errors in scholarship and speaks to the variety of interpretations found among patristic exegetes.[94] Noting that *some* early exegetes read the spirit as the Holy Spirit also demonstrates that such a reading is possible for ancient readers. It does not, however, actually demonstrate why that reading is more probable than any other reading. So, we must look more closely at his other two points.

When one considers these other two points, one encounters significant problems. It is true that for Paul (and other NT writers) it is unusual "to use the articular form, τὸ πνεῦμα, without qualification to describe human spirit(s)."[95] But, it is also unusual to use τὸ πνεῦμα without qualification to refer to the Holy Spirit! The vast majority of texts that use τὸ πνεῦμα include clear contextual signs that clarify whether the spirit in question is the holy spirit or some other spirit.[96] Suh's further claim that Paul "never uses the nominative articular form to describe anything other than the Holy Spirit" is simply incorrect.[97]

---

[94] He notes some errors in the work of, for example, Brenneman 2005.

[95] Suh 2020, 74.

[96] For example, verses that qualify articular πνεῦμα with the word ἅγιος include: Mk 3:29, 13:11; Luke 3:22; John 1:33; Acts 1:16, 2:4, 5:32, 10:44, 10:47, 11:12, 11:15, 13:2, 15:8, 19:6, 20:23, 20:28, 21:11, 28:25; Eph 4:30; 1 Thess 4:8; Heb 3:7, 10:15. Other texts qualify the spirit variously. For example, In Rom 8:11, the spirit is the one who raised Jesus from the dead. In 2 Cor 3:17, the spirit is identified as the Lord's.

[97] Suh 2020, 74. See 1 Cor 2:11–12, 14:14; 2 Cor 7:13; 1 Thess 5:23 for examples where nominative articular πνεῦμα does not refer to the holy spirit.

His third reason is similarly flawed. 1 Cor 5 is communal in focus, but this does not mean Paul must be concerned to maintain the spirit's presence in the community by expelling pollution. In fact, Paul explains why the pollution must be expelled in 5:8, and it is not for the maintenance of the Holy Spirit's presence. Instead, Paul urges expulsion of pollution so that the Corinthians may celebrate the festival. There is simply no indication that Paul is warning of the potential loss of the Holy Spirit.[98]

Reading τὸ πνεῦμα in 1 Cor 5:5 as the man's spirit is more plausible because of the use of τὸ πνεῦμα elsewhere in the NT, the use of σώζω elsewhere in the NT, and the context of "the day" in 1 Cor 5:5. In regards to τὸ πνεῦμα, it is clear that Paul can use this word to indicate a human spirit as opposed to some other aspect of human life.[99] This is seen in, for example 1 Thess 5:23. Here Paul hopes that God will keep the Thessalonians' spirits (τὸ πνεῦμα), souls (ἡ ψυχή), and bodies (τὸ σῶμα) blameless.[100] It is also possible for τὸ πνεῦμα, without a possessive pronoun, to indicate a person's spirit,[101] because this is found in Matt 27:50 and John 19:30.[102] All of this means reading τὸ πνεῦμα here as the man's Spirit is possible. In regards to σώζω, we

[98] Rosner 1991, 144, sees a possible link to the Jerusalem temple in 1 Cor 5. He says, "Having cleansed 'the temple' Paul calls upon the congregation to celebrate spiritually the festival of Passover/Unleavened Bread in 1 Corinthians 5:7-8. That this sequence of events sprang to Paul's mind may itself testify to the influence of the OT temple motif since in the OT there is an observable link between cleansing or restoring the temple and celebrating the Passover." However, even if this link is present, this still does not establish that Paul is trying to maintain the Spirit's presence in the temple constituted by the Corinthians' community.

[99] My position here is similar to Boyarin 1997, 61, who argues "Flesh can be cleansed of defilement in Paul, but it is a separate, distinct element of which human beings are composed . . . Whatever the delivery unto Satan means and however the flesh is to be destroyed, it is clear that Paul holds that it is the spirit which will be saved at the end."

[100] Cf. Matt 26:41 and Mark 14:38 in which the flesh (σάρξ) and the spirit (πνεῦμα) are contrasted as apparently distinct elements of a person.

[101] The lack of a possessive pronoun is a key part of the argument made by DeMaris 2008, 48.

[102] In both of these texts, Jesus's death is signalled by the giving up of τὸ πνεῦμα with no pronoun to clarify that it is his spirit.

do not see πνεῦμα as not the object of this word elsewhere in the NT, and so there is no precedent in these texts to suppose that Paul is using σώζω to mean "preserve," as in, "to preserve" the Spirit's presence.[103] Finally, the reference to "the day" in 1 Cor 5:5 makes it likely that τὸ πνεῦμα is the man's spirit. In 1 Cor 3:10–15, we find an instance of evaluation on the day and σώζω is used there to refer to the salvation of a person. Since the spirit in 1 Cor 5:5 is saved on the day of the Lord, it seems likely that this passage also deals with the salvation of a person.

I have argued here that 1 Cor 5:5 is not about preserving the presence of the Holy Spirit in the face of pollution. If I am correct, then it is unclear in Paul's letters whether the spirit is lost as the result of sin. This opens up a point of potential compatability between the effects of temple destruction in 1 Cor 3:16–17 and major metaphysical pollution. It is now necessary to consider what Paul does say will happen as a result of temple destruction in order to know the extent to which the effects of temple destruction cohere with major metaphysical pollution.

4.5.3 – The Identified Effect of Temple Destruction in 1 Cor 3:17

Paul does not mention the loss of God's Spirit here, but only the destruction of the person who destroys the temple. The language used here is brief and restricted. If anyone destroys God's temple, then God will destroy that person (φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός). I noted in chapter 2 that sacrilege is not dangerous because it always drives away the gods, but more usually because it leads to a variety of physical dangers. Ancient writers emphasise these dangers to warn against doing certain things, to urge people to do certain things so, or to explain the reason why a certain

[103] Suh 2020, 75–76, notes this, but believes that the potential destruction of the temple in 1 Cor 3:16–17, a situation which, for him, threatens the presence of the spirit, alleviates this difficulty. He rightly notes Paul's idea "that someone can in fact 'destroy' (φθείρω) the temple and in that process even damage the presence of the Spirit of God dwelling within it," but he does not establish why this danger to the temple and the Spirit also means that the Spirit can be expelled by sin or why this would make us translate σώζω as "preserve."

misfortune occurred.[104] The fact that Paul says nothing about the loss of God's Spirit (either here or elsewhere), but instead presents only the destruction of the guilty as a consequence of temple destruction, bears great similarity to the many discussions of sacrilege that follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution.

To be clear, the argument I have advanced is one from silence. As such, it does not prove that Paul believes God's presence to be assured regardless of sin. Rather, my point is that Paul certainly does not draw attention to the possibility that one could lose the Holy Spirit in this text. His emphasis remains squarely on only one result of temple desecration: destruction of the destroyer. This emphatic attention to destruction as a result of sacrilege is what resembles other discussions of sacrilege and judgement so closely.

I have shown here that in Paul's extant letters he emphasises the Holy Spirit's presence among believers rather than emphasising the loss of the Holy Spirit as a result of sin, and so we should not assume that he is implying the loss of the Spirit in 1 Cor 3:17 without some clear warrant. I then underscored how Paul mentions only destruction of the guilty as an effect of temple destruction, and noted how closely this parallels discussions of sacrilege in other ancient literature. I conclude, then, that the described effects of temple destruction in 1 Cor 3:16–17 can cohere with concepts of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution. The final question is whether the ultimate resolution of this crime also coheres with these concepts.

4.6 – "God Will Destroy" and Judgement Against the Sacrilegious

[104] To present just one example, in Strabo, *Geogr*. 8.3.33, the fear of major metaphysical pollution and its assumed consequences serves both to deter one from invading sacred land, and to encourage one to protect that sacred land.

In chapter 2, I noted three key features related to the resolution of major metaphysical pollution. First, it is usually the sacrilegious person who endures judgement, not the temple that he or she pollutes. Second, judgement is generally realised physically, for example, through sickness, death, and so on. Third, judgement is frequently inevitable. There is no over-arching system like the Day of Atonement for alleviating the dangerous pollution the sacrilegious person acquires. In many cases, writers specifically mention that a polluted person is unable to remove the serious pollution by any means of purification. The final area of comparison between Paul's use of temple imagery and the logic of major metaphysical pollution is this issue of resolution.

In this section, I will look at how temple destruction is resolved in 3:17. My analysis will proceed in three sections. I will begin by asking about the object of judgement in 3:17. Does it look like it is the temple or the temple destroyer who is destroyed? I will then consider the way Paul describes judgement. Is it possible that Paul is using the language of physical judgement here? Would that be consistent with his theology? Finally, We must consider whether this judgement is presented as if there is hope for avoiding it, or if it is presented as certain in the event that someone destroys the temple.

4.6.1 – Judgement Against the Temple and Against the Temple Destroyer

I noted in chapter 2 that, in the OT, moral pollution is incurred by a variety of serious offences that may or may not include direct action taken against the temple.[105] I noted also that this moral pollution accumulates over time and can lead to the loss of God's presence in the temple and the land. The people of Israel experience judgement from God in response to this pollution, which includes, ultimately, the destruction of the temple itself by foreign powers and exile for Israel.[106]

Josephus's account of the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, although saturated by interaction with major metaphysical pollution, nonetheless coheres with the OT at this point. In Josephus's view, the pollution of the temple leads to the destruction of the guilty *and also the polluted temple* at the hands of the Romans. He says explicitly that this destruction of the temple is caused by God. "God it is then, God Himself," according to Josephus in *Jewish War*, "who with the Romans is bringing the fire to purge His temple and exterminating a city so laden with pollutions."[107] So, like the OT, Josephus depicts the destruction of the temple as one aspect of God's judgement against those who polluted it.

In 1 Cor 3:16–17, however, there are two signs that the temple destroyer is the one destroyed by God rather than the temple. First, the use of οὗτος to resume the subject identified by τις in a conditional sentence is common in the NT. In 1 Cor 8:3, Paul says that if someone loves God, that same person is known by God (εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ). The οὗτος refers to the same person as the τις. Similarly, here some person (τις) threatens

[105] These include primarily idolatry, sexual sin, and bloodshed.

[106] Texts such as Jer 26:4–6 are particularly important here, as they make explicit the connection between the destruction of the temple and judgement from God, but see also various Psalms such as Pss 74 and Pss 137.

[107] Josephus, *J.W.* 6.110 [Thackeray].

the temple with destruction, and this is met by judgement that is restricted to the singular τοῦτον (resuming τις) who God destroys.[108]

Second, Käsemann identifies a pattern in this passage found also in other Greek texts where a chiasm highlights that an instance of judgement corresponds closely to the crime. This chiasm is as follows:

A εἴ τις
B τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ
C φθείρει
C' φθερεῖ
B' τοῦτον
A' ὁ θεός

Positioning φθείρω at the centre of the chiasm and repeating the same word in succession stresses the equivalence between the crime and the punishment inflicted against the very person who commits the crime.[109] This movement from an act of sacrilegious temple destruction to the destruction of that destroyer rather than the destruction of the whole polluted structure or community bears remarkable similarity to the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution.

I have now argued that the judgement in 1 Cor 3:16–17, directed only against the temple destroyer and not the polluted temple or the community, mirrors a pattern common to

[108] Cf. Rom 8:9; James 1:23; 3:2.

[109] Käsemann 1955, 248. Käsemann's argument tying 1 Cor 3:17 to a *Sitz im Leben* of prophetic utterance has been critiqued by Berger 1970; Hill 1979, 171–74; and Aune 1983, 167–69 and 237–40. Nonetheless, he is right to note the connection between guilt and punishment in this text: "Das gleiche Verbum umschreibt in dem Chiasmus des Vorder- und Nachsatzes menschliche Schuld und göttliches Gericht, um auf diese Weise sowohl die präzise Entsprechung beider Sachverhalte wie ihre unzerreißbare und jähe Folge zu charakterisieren." For other texts that Käsemann presents as preeminent examples of this pattern, see Gen 9:6 (ὁ ἐκχέων αἷμα ἀνθρώπου ἀντὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ ἐκχυθήσεται – "Whoever pours out the blood of man, so his blood will be poured out" [my translation]) and Aeschylus, *Cho.* 312–13 (ἀντὶ δὲ πληγῆς φονίας φονίαν πληγὴν τινέτω – "and for a murderous stroke let a murderous stroke be paid" [my translation]).

discussions of sacrilege, but this does not complete the comparison between Paul's temple imagery and other texts that rely on the logic of major metaphysical pollution. The way judgement occurs in these texts follows a pattern. In the next sections I will continue to analyse the extent to which Paul follows this pattern and ask if judgement in 1 Cor 3:16–17 is, as in so much other ancient literature, both physical and inevitable.

4.6.2 – Physical Judgement in 1 Cor 3:17

4.6.2.1 – Conditional Sentences and Physical Judgement

1 Cor 3:17 contains a conditional sentence: "If anyone destroys God's temple, God will destroy that person." Many scholars claim the future tense of φθείρω in the apodosis of this sentence indicates that Paul has the eschatological future in mind. Thus, by this reading, the judgement is not something that afflicts the temple destroyer immediately and physically, but rather something that happens at the final judgement. Käsemann's influential essay on this text compares 1 Cor 3:16–17 with several other texts that deal with retributive justice and says:

> Was ihn von den genannten Parallelen trennt, ist einzig dies, daß das hier verkündigte Gesetz nicht durch Menschen vollstreckt wird, sondern das Gesetz des göttlichen Handelns vom jüngsten Tage ist. Das *jus talionis* ist, wie das Futur des Nachsatzes anzeigt, auf eschatologische Ebene verlagert, und das ist möglich, weil nach der zugrundeliegenden Anschauung der jüngste Tag unmittelbar bevorsteht.[110]

David Kuck states, "The ius talionis form leaves no doubt that anyone responsible for such destruction will be condemned at the final judgment."[111] In his footnote, he says, "The future form φθερεῖ is read by a majority of witnesses," presumably implying that it is this future tense

[110] Käsemann 1955, 249.

[111] Kuck 1992, 188.

verb that influences him to see judgement in eschatological terms.[112] Hogeterp, more hesitantly, says, "The eschatological orientation which pervades Paul's description of the building process appears to determine Paul's temple imagery as well, as the future tense φθερεῖ in 1 Cor 3:17 may indicate."[113]

It certainly does seem that the future verb in the conditional sentence in 1 Cor 3:16–17 points to *some* sort of future judgement. Even a scholar such as Stanley Porter, who argues that tense-forms do not grammaticalise time, nonetheless calls the future tense "an anomaly in the Greek verbal network" and claims that it "grammaticalizes the semantic feature of [+expectation]."[114] Expectation seems future-referring. Similarly, Constantine Campbell maintains "the traditional analysis of the future indicative that regards the form as a future-referring tense."[115] What is more, while the temporal relationship between protasis and apodosis is not always tied clearly to verb tense,[116] future tense verbs in the apodoses of first-class conditionals in the New Testament generally indicate future time.

Even so, the use of the future tense in the apodosis of a conditional does not, alone, guarantee that an event will happen in the *eschatological* future, because in many passages

[112] Kuck 1992, 188, n. 108.

[113] Hogeterp 2006, 322.

[114] Porter 1989, 403.

[115] C. Campbell 2012, 157.

[116] So Porter 1999, 258–59. Any number of conditional sentences could be used to support this case. For example, Matt 8:31 contains a conditional that says: Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων. If we rely strictly on the tense of the verbs in the conditional to tell us the temporal relationship between the protasis and apodosis, we must conclude that, in the context of the narrative, Jesus is presently casting out the demons and that they went (in the past) into the pigs, but this is nonsense. The protasis employs a present indicative verb (ἐκβάλλεις) to indicate what must be a future action since, in the context of the story, the event has yet to occur. The apodosis uses an aorist tense (ἀπόστειλον) to refer to an action that could not precede the action of the protasis, although they could potentially occur at the same time.

conditionals with future tense verbs clearly refer to actions not awaiting the eschaton. In Acts 5:39 the apostles are brought before the Sanhedrin. Some members of the council want to kill the apostles immediately, so Gamaliel warns them that if the apostles' work is of human origin it will fail, but if it is from God the council will not be able to overthrow them.[117] This conditional contains a future tense in the apodosis (δυνήσεσθε) used to refer to an action that is clearly not relegated to the eschaton. Matt 17:4 says εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσω ὧδε τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν καὶ Ἠλίᾳ μίαν. This seems, again, not to be a proposal that would await eschatological fulfilment. Other passages could likewise be analysed here.[118] While this analysis leaves open the possibility that judgement in 1 Cor 3:17 will occur in the day of the Lord, this is not required by the future tense apodosis.[119]

Nor does the fact that God is the one executing the judgement in this conditional change that fact. To be sure, there are passages in the NT in which God's activity points towards the eschaton. This is particularly common in cases where Paul discusses the coming resurrection of the dead (e.g., 1 Cor 6:14, 2 Cor 4:14, and 1 Thess 4:14). And yet, there are also passages in which God is the subject of a future tense verb and the action is not apparently going to occur in the eschaton. Consider 2 Cor 9:10 in which God will supply (χορηγήσει) and multiply (πληθυνεῖ) the seed for sowing and increase (αὐξήσει) the harvest of righteousness. This is tied to the gathering of a gift for the saints, which does not appear to be something that will be given only in

[117] Εἰ δὲ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐστιν, οὐ δυνήσεσθε καταλῦσαι αὐτούς.

[118] E.g., Matt 26:33; Luke 16:12; John 15:20.

[119] We should also not rely on the presence of the future in the apodosis to prove that the conditional is a threat or an "earnest appeal to the feelings," contra Brookins and Longenecker 2016, 80–81, 83; who follow Smyth 1920, 525, para. 2328. Cf. Gildersleeve 1876, 9. There are several first-class conditionals in the NT with a future tense apodosis that are not threats, e.g., the second conditional in Rom 8:13 and the conditional in 1 Thess 4:14. The interpretation of 1 Cor 3:17 as a threat should depend on the content of the conditional sentence, not the grammar.

the day of the Lord. Similarly, in 1 Cor 10:13, Paul affirms that God will not allow (ἐάσει) the Corinthians to be tempted beyond what they can bear. This too seems grounded in the Corinthians' need to resist temptation in the present age, not in the day of the Lord. It is possible for a future tense verb with God as the subject to refer to the eschaton, but these passages establish that it is not necessarily the case that any particular verb does. So, we must depend on context to provide greater clarity.

The context of 1 Cor 3:16–17 does not constrain us to see this judgement as eschatological. It is true that the day is prominent in 1 Cor 3:10–15, however, I argued earlier in this chapter that the argument shifts from 1 Cor 3:10–15 to 1 Cor 3:16–17, that 1 Cor 3:10–15 is a sub-set in Paul's argument against division, and that the judgements described in these two groups of verses are not the same. If this is correct, then the day of the Lord mentioned in 1 Cor 3:10–15 may not still be in view in 1 Cor 3:16–17. This means we are justified to question whether the judgement in 1 Cor 3:17 is eschatological.

If a conditional sentence with God as the subject and a future tense verb in the apodosis does not unequivocally point to the eschatological future, and if 1 Cor 3:16–17 differs from 1 Cor 3:10–15 in topic as I have argued, then we cannot assume that the judgement in 1 Cor 3:17 happens in the day of the Lord. Establishing this much opens the possibility that judgement is realised in the present age and that it is realised physically. I will next consider the particular use of φθείρω in 1 Cor 3:17 and the broader issue of physical judgement in 1 Corinthians in order to determine whether Paul's language is indicative of a physical judgement.

4.6.2.2 – Φθείρω as Physical Judgement

Paul uses the word φθείρω, the same word he uses to indicate the desecration of the temple, to indicate God's judgement, but what does this word mean in this context? Many scholars rightly

note that 1 Cor 3:17 contains a wordplay in which φθείρω is used twice consecutively to mean two different things, namely, a human act that harms the temple and God's act of judgment against that person.[120] Scholars also frequently debate the meaning of the first φθείρω, bringing in evidence from other texts to support their claims.[121] It is rare, however, for a scholar to make a more serious attempt to understand the second φθείρω in light of its use to indicate judgement from God. I will consider the use of φθείρω as judgement from the gods in order to ask whether φθείρω here can mark physical judgement in response to sacrilege.

Φθ* words (esp. καταφθείρω) are often used in the LXX to describe God's acts of judgement, and this judgement is frequently physical. Consider, for example, God's act of judgement through the flood in Gen 6:13, 17, and 9:11;[122] the threat of destruction from God via the armies of Shishak in 2 Chron 12:7; and God's judgment against Amaziah in 2 Chron 25:16. There is also a biblical text apart from 1 Cor 3:17 in which a φθ* word refers to judgment against someone who desecrates a temple, and in this instance the judgement so indicated is physical. This occurrence is found in 2 Chron 26:16–20. The episode begins with an assertion that Uzziah grew proud "to destruction" (καταφθείρω). The nature of this destruction is further elucidated as the writer explains Uzziah enters the temple of the Lord to offer an unauthorised sacrifice.

---

[120] E.g., Weiss 1925, 85, calls this wordplay *antanaklasis*, as does Bitner 2015b, 273, who follows him. Caragounis 2006, 466, calls this wordplay *logopaignia.* Brookins and Longenecker 2016, 84, refer to it as *traductio*. Sampley 2002, 831, refrains from labelling the wordplay but notes that the repetition of a single word with different meanings is encouraged in ancient rhetorical handbooks. He cites several examples from *Rhet. Her.* 4.14.21 as support. While these scholars adopt various means of classification and rely on distinctive data to support their belief in the presence of a wordplay in 1 Cor 3:17, all of them note an essential dissimilarity in meaning between the two uses of φθείρω here.

[121] E.g., Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 161, interpret the first φθείρω in light of its use in 2 Corinthians. Liu 2013, 122, analyses the word by comparison to its use in Plutarch and the LXX.

[122] Philo likewise uses a φθ* word to refer to God's judgement through the flood, but he chooses διαφθείρω rather than καταφθείρω. See Philo, *Unchangeable*, 5.21.

Because of this act, God strikes him with leprosy. These cases that deal with judgement from God both in general and in relation to a specific crime against the temple demonstrate that φθ* words could be used of imminent, physical judgment from God in the LXX.

The LXX use of φθ* words like καταφθείρω and διαφθείρω is informative for our understanding of φθείρω in 1 Cor 3:17 because all three words can be used more or less interchangeably in the LXX.[123] All three words can be used to indicate moral corruption,[124] decay or ruination,[125] and absolute physical destruction.[126] In some passages, two distinct φθ* words are used to refer to what is apparently the same event. Isa 24 opens with a warning that the Lord will destroy (καταφθείρω) the earth. Isa 24:3–4 repeats the warning saying: "the earth shall be utterly laid waste (φθορᾷ φθαρήσεται) and utterly despoiled; for the LORD has spoken this word." In both cases, the distinct φθ* words refer to the coming judgement of the Lord. Finally, the same underlying Hebrew word can be translated by multiple variations of the φθ* words, even in the space of only two verses. In Gen 6:11–12, שחת is translated consecutively as both

[123] This is similar to the point made by Bitner 2015b, 220, n. 123, that there was little difference in meaning between φθείρω and διαφθείρω in the first century. This is in contrast to, e.g., Lanci 1997, 67, who argues for a sharper distinction between διαφθείρω, which he maintains refers to complete destruction, and φθείρω, which he believes indicates some sort of incomplete ruination.

[124] For διαφθείρω as moral corruption, see Pss 52:2 (LXX) (διεφθάρησαν καὶ ἐβδελύχθησαν ἐν ἀνομίαις). For φθείρω, see Hos 9:9 (ἐφθάρησαν κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ βουνοῦ· μνησθήσεται ἀδικίας αὐτοῦ, ἐκδικήσει ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ). For κατάφθείρω, see 2 Chron 27:2 (καὶ ἐποίησεν τὸ εὐθὲς ἐνώπιον Κυρίου . . . . καὶ ἔτι ὁ λαὸς κατεφθείρετο).

[125] For διαφθείρω as decay or ruination, see Judg 16:7 (καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὴν Σαμψών ἐὰν δήσωσί με ἐν ἑπτὰ νευραῖς ὑγραῖς μὴ διεφθαρμέναις, καὶ ἀσθενήσω καὶ ἔσομαι ὡς εἷς τῶν ἀνθρώπων). For φθείρω, see Jer 13:7–9. Here, Jeremiah uncovers the ruined (διαφθείρω) loincloth and the Lord says, Οὕτω φθερῶ τὴν ὕβριν Ιουδα καὶ τὴν ὕβριν Ιερουσαλημ. For κατάφθείρω, see 2 Kgdms 14:14 (καὶ ὥσπερ τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ καταφερόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὃ οὐ συναχθήσεται).

[126] For διαφθείρω as physical destruction, see Jer 12:10 (ποιμένες πολλοὶ διέφθειραν τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου). For φθείρω, see 2 Kgdms 20:20 (καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ιωαβ καὶ εἶπεν Ἵλεώς μοι ἵλεώς μοι, εἰ καταποντιῶ καὶ εἰ διαφθερῶ). For κατάφθείρω, see Isa 13:5 (ἔρχεσθαι ἐκ γῆς πόρρωθεν ἀπ᾽ ἄκρου θεμελίου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, κύριος καὶ οἱ ὁπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ, τοῦ καταφθεῖραι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην).

φθείρω and καταφθείρω, and in both verses the words are used to refer to the moral corruption of humanity as characterised by its violence. The potential interchangeability of these three words in the LXX means that the use of καταφθείρω in the LXX to indicate physical judgement against those guilty of sacrilege is relevant for our reading of 1 Cor 3:17.

Φθ* words are also used to indicate physical judgement against the sacrilegious in several ancient texts outside of the LXX, which further strengthens the possibility that φθείρω is used in the same way in 1 Cor 3:17. Pausanias uses φθείρω in two different texts to refer to acts of destruction visited by the gods upon people who desecrate temples. In the first, enemy soldiers aim to enter the temple of the Cabeiri, but they are destroyed (ἐφθάρησαν) by fire from heaven.[127] In the second, Melanippus and Comaetho have sex in the temple of Artemis, which is seen as upsetting the honour due the gods (ἀνατρέψαι θεῶν τιμάς). Artemis responds by destroying (ἔφθειρε) people, causing crop failure, and spreading disease until the guilty couple is sacrificed.[128] Appian tells a story in which the Autarienses march against the temple of Delphi, but are destroyed (φθαρῆναι) before they can defile it.[129] Strabo cites a disagreement about which god bore responsibility for the destruction (φθορα) of Asias, and includes Athena, who hated him for sacrilege against her temple, among the options.[130] In both the LXX and other Greek literature, then, one finds many examples of φθ* words indicating judgement from God or the

[127] Pausanias, *Descr.* 9.25.10.

[128] Pausanias, *Descr.* 7.19.4–6.

[129] Appian, *Hist. Rom.* 9.2.4.

[130] Strabo, *Geogr.* 13.1.4.

fury of the gods directed against people who desecrate temples, and this judgement is usually realised physically. This makes it possible that Paul could use such language in the same way.

This analysis demonstrates that for Paul to use φθείρω in 1 Cor 3:17 to indicate a physical judgement from God against a sacrilegious temple desecrator is possible given the word he chooses to refer to that judgement. Φθ* words are used extensively in the LXX to signify physical destruction from God, and, more importantly, to signify such destruction precisely in contexts that include sacrilege committed against a temple. Similar uses of φθείρω are attested in many other texts. Thus, Paul could have the same meaning in mind when he mentions God's act against the temple destroyer in 1 Cor 3:17. This raises one final question: is it really conceivable that Paul would link an act of sacrilegious temple desecration with some sort of physical consequences?[131] We can answer this question by considering whether he links serious crimes with physically realised judgement in any other passages. I will do precisely this in the next section, where I will consider Paul's response to abuses of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor 11:27–34.

4.6.2.3 – Physical Judgement in 1 Cor 11:27–34

In 1 Cor 11:27–34 Paul warns that those who eat and drink unworthily are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord (ἔνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου). The use of ἔνοχος with the genitive can indicate the person or thing against whom a crime is committed,[132] which in this

[131] When giving a portion of this dissertation in a session at SBL 2019, this precise question was raised. The one asking said he would have a hard time believing that God would punish someone in a physical way. What is important, however, is not whether I or any other scholar thinks God would punish someone with physical judgement. What is important is whether *Paul* thought God would do so.

[132] Cf. Jas 2:10: "For whoever keeps the whole law and yet stumbles at just one point is guilty of breaking all of it" (ὅστις γὰρ ὅλον τὸν νόμον τηρήσῃ, πταίσῃ δὲ ἐν ἑνί, γέγονεν πάντων ἔνοχος). While ἔνοχος with the genitive can also indicate either the punishment to which one is liable or the crime which one has committed, neither seems likely in this instance because neither the punishment nor the nature of the crime is spelled out following this genitive. Matt 26:66, for example, reads: Ἔνοχος θανάτου ἐστίν. By placing the punishment, death (θανάτου), in the genitive following ἔνοχος, the author indicates that ἔνοχος here explains the punishment to which one is liable.

case is the Lord himself.[133] By defining the target of this crime as the Lord, Paul underscores its severity.[134] Paul then immediately commands a constrasting means of eating and drinking in 1 Cor 11:28, namely, he urges the Corinthians not to eat and drink unworthily (which would make them guilty of the body and blood of the Lord) but rather to test themselves and then eat and drink appropriately. He then warns of the consequences of failing to heed this advice in 1 Cor 11:29: "For (γὰρ) all who eat and drink without discerning the body, eat and drink judgment (κρίμα) against themselves."

The very next paragraph establishes that this judgement has already taken place, and that it is experienced physically. Paul explains that many of the Corinthians are weak, sick, or dead (πολλοὶ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἄρρωστοι καὶ κοιμῶνται), but the appearance of these afflictions is not, in his interpretation, a coincidence. Instead, he establishes the reason for this through the use of διὰ τοῦτο, which connects the content of 1 Cor 11:30 to the previous verse. It is the Corinthians' failure to discern the body that has caused their current circumstances, and has led to these serious afflictions in their community. A minority of scholars have suggested that these afflictions are to be understood in a spiritual sense, meaning here that the sickness and death are

---

Similarly, in Mark 3:29, the author follows ἔνοχός with ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος, thus spelling out the nature of the crime, namely, that it is an eternal sin.

[133] Because "body of Christ" is elsewhere used in reference to the church in 1 Corinthians, it might seem possible to read the body and blood of the Lord in this passage as a reference to the church too. However, the fact that this passage refers both to the body (σῶμα) and the blood (αἷμα) suggests this is a reference rather to the Lord's body and blood as represented by the sacramental elements. The only other time σῶμα is paired with αἷμα in 1 Corinthians is in 1 Cor 10:16, where the object of discussion is clearly the sacrament. I am in agreement here with Barrett 1971, 273, who says, "That *body* is not to be interpreted here as equivalent to *church* is shown by the addition of *blood*."

[134] In ancient literature, ἔνοχος is also used frequently to indicate guilt of sacrilege that requires judgment. Aristotle, *Oec.* 2.2.20 reads, "Anyone who failed to comply [with the supposed command of Demeter] would, he declared, be guilty of sacrilege" (τὸν δὲ μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσαντα ἔνοχον ἔφησεν ἱεροσυλίας ἔσεσθαι). Cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities* 6.89.4; Demosthenes, *Andr.* 22.70; *Timocr.* 24.177. The two texts from Demosthenes explicitly label ἔνοχος of sacrilege as an offense worthy of death.

experienced in a non-bodily manner. As Ilaria Ramelli puts it, Paul means "the sickness and the death of the soul, of which he speaks also in Romans and which are mentioned in other NT passages as well and in several contemporary philosophers, both Middle Platonists and Stoics."[135] Their arguments are varied. Sebastian Schneider claims that taking weakness, illness, and death in physical terms causes grammatical and logical difficulties,[136] while Ramelli contends from the precedent of ancient exegetes, Paul's linguistic tendencies, and Hellenistic tropes that a spiritual reading is plausible.[137]

These scholars have failed to shift the scholarly conversation in this spiritual direction, however.[138] Certainly, ἀσθενής is used in the Bible to refer to weakness of, e.g., the conscience,[139] but κοιμάω is only used in Paul's extant letters to refer to physical death[140] and ἄρρωστος is only used in the NT to refer to physical illness.[141] Suh even goes so far as to claim that, in the first five centuries CE, "the dual use of the terms ἀσθενής and ἄρρωστος is limited to Greek medical literature, always in reference to physical, and not spiritual, maladies" and "the individual occurrences of ἀσθενής and ἄρρωστος in Greek literature of all genres clearly

[135] Ramelli 2011, 149.

[136] Schneider 1996.

[137] Ramelli 2011.

[138] Most scholars continue to view these conditions as physical. Even some very recent articles written since both Schneider and Ramelli published their work, and interacting with them, cast doubt on the spiritual interpretation. See Dijkhuizen 2016, and Downs 2019.

[139] 1 Cor 8:7.

[140] 1 Cor 7:39, 15:6, 15:18, 15:20, 15:51; 1 Thess 4:13–15. Even outside of Paul, κοιμάω is only used either to indicate physical death or to indicate actual sleep (as in Matt 28:13; Luke 22:45; John 11:12; Acts 12:6).

[141] Matt 14:14; Mark 6:5, 6:13, 16:18.

demonstrate that these words did not maintain the semantic range that Ramelli posits."[142] Even if Suh overstates his point, the pattern of usage he highlights makes a spiritual reading seem unlikely without strong contextual indicators that here, in contrast to his more usual pattern, Paul is using these words in a "spiritualised" manner. In fact, Downs' chief critique of both Schneider and Ramelli is precisely that they provide insufficient interaction with the immediate context of 1 Cor 11 to establish their readings as the more probable ones.[143] It is more likely, then, that Paul believes the Corinthians are experiencing judgement through physical afflictions.

Importantly, whether this constitutes an "*ad hoc*" reflection by Paul[144] and whether it is "oriented towards correction rather than condemnation"[145] is inconsequential for the point I am making here. The important point for my argument is that, when confronted by physical afflictions such as weakness, illness, and death, Paul claims that they are the result of a serious offence against the Lord. The fact that he does this establishes that he could causally link a serious crime to a kind of judgement that is experienced physically. This makes my reading of God's judgement in 1 Cor 3:17 as a physical judgement plausible.

When 1 Cor 11:27–34 is taken into consideration, along with the observations concerning conditional sentences and the use of φθείρω to indicate God's judgement, it seems likely that the judgement in 1 Cor 3:17 is physical. It remains to be seen, however, whether Paul also presents

---

[142] Suh 2020, 102. Suh's references to Greek primary sources are vast on these points. His citations include: Hippocrates, *Acut*. 9.13; 9.29; Pindar, *Pyth*. 55; Aeschylus, *Prom*. 517; Thucydides, 4.126.4; Euripides, *Med*. 807; *Hec*. 798; *Heracl*. 23; Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 6.111; 9.31; Isocrates, *Plat*. 20; Aristophanes, *Eccl*. 539; Xenophon, *Mem*. 1.4.6; 2.6.12; *Cyr*. 5.2.22; Isocrates, *Panath*. 9; Plutarch, *Ages*. 27.2; *Quaest. conv*. 635C; Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History*. 3.13.3; 4.71.1; 13.18.6; Appian, *Bell. civ*. 4.6.44; Epictetus, *Diatr*. 3.13.21, 26.23; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities* 7.12.3, 68.3; Strabo, *Geogr*. 3.3.7; 16.1.20, and others.

[143] "Tellingly, both Ramelli and Schneider, in defending a spiritual interpretation of 1 Cor 11:30, only briefly acknowledge the literary context of the verse" (Downs 2019, 576–77).

[144] As Fee 1987, 565, claims.

[145] So Lakey 2019, 146.

this judgement as something inevitable. In the next several sections I will address this by appeal to the nature of conditional sentences and to the emphasis Paul places on the perpetrator as the object of judgement.

4.6.3 – The Inevitability of Judgement

Many Pauline scholars focus on the positive application of the warning Paul gives in 1 Cor 3:17. Hogeterp, for example, highlights how the temple image could help the Corinthians reach a "mature communal identity as a congregation of God."[146] Fee explains that this image provides an "invitation to become what in fact they are by the grace of God."[147] Ciampa and Rosner claim, "the initial affective impact of the identification of the church of God in Corinth as a temple is to dignify them."[148] Each of these scholars is right to note the positive potential of the temple imagery to shape the Corinthians' self-perception and encourage them to live a life characterised by holiness. Nonetheless, we must ask if the content of 1 Cor 3:16–17 highlights these positive applications, or if the greater emphasis in the text is on judgement. Does Paul present this judgement as if it unavoidable? Here I will consider Paul's use of a conditional sentence to describe the conditions for judgement and ask what it says about the way Paul presents judgement. I will then look at the way Paul shapes the warning and what he says about avoiding destruction.

[146] Hogeterp 2006, 325.

[147] Fee 1987, 149.

[148] Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 159.

4.6.3.1 – Conditional Sentences and the Certainty of the Apodosis

The first issue to consider is the way Paul presents the relationship between temple destruction and judgement in he conditional sentence of 1 Cor 3:17. An older stream of biblical scholarship held that the first class conditional was the condition of present reality.[149] Against this, James Boyer provides an analysis of the approximately 300 first-class conditionals in the New Testament, and demonstrates that in only 37% of these conditionals can one show that the condition is clearly "true," that is, an accurate representation of the world itself.[150] In light of his analysis, we cannot assume that a conditional sentence is true (or false for that matter) simply because it is constructed in the form of a first-class conditional. What we can say, and what Boyer argues, is that the conditional represents a logical connection between its two parts such that "the result (the apodosis) is as sure as the condition (the protasis)."[151]

What this means is that when we read a conditional sentence like the one in 1 Cor 3:17, we read Paul presenting judgement as if it is certain in the event that someone destroys the temple. Importantly, this is not to say that God *actually will* destroy the temple destroyer. This cannot be determined from the conditional. My point is that Paul's *presentation* of judgement depicts a certain judgement. This is in contrast to Yulin Liu, who says "The conditional phrase, εἴ τις (if someone) with the indicative verb φθερεῖ, describes a present reality or a *possible* consequence which can result from the presupposition," and again, "Clearly, Paul's meaning is that the temple *can* suffer damage from the activities of the irresponsible builder."[152] For Liu, the

[149] Consider Blass and Debrunner 1961, 189.

[150] Boyer 1981.

[151] Boyer 1981, 82. See also the discussions in Porter 1999, 256–57; Wallace 1996, 690–91.

[152] Liu 2013, 122 (emphasis mine).

consequences of temple destruction, as Paul presents them, seem uncertain. Actually, within the logic of the conditional, if someone destroys the temple, God will surely destroy that person.

4.6.3.2 – Emphasis and Judgement

In addition to the fact that judgement is presented as certain by the conditional sentence in 1 Cor 3:17, two other elements of this text highlight judgement and thus may speak to whether Paul presents it as certain. The first is that Paul draws attention to the perpetrator as the object of judgement and thereby underscores the danger facing him. He does this by introducing the subject (τις) at the beginning of the sentence, then referring back to that subject with the demonstrative τοῦτον. Resuming something previously mentioned with οὗτος is one way that NT writers emphasise the thing under discussion. In other words, the sentence communicates: "If *anyone* harms the temple, God will destroy *that very person*."[153] Second, Paul does not say anything to assure his readers that the perpetrator will, ultimately, escape from punishment. This is surprising given the immediate context of 1 Cor 3:15 where Paul was at pains to communicate that, regardless of the quality of one's work, he or she will be saved after the work is tested by fire, even though he will suffer loss.[154]

These data suggest a stark emphasis on judgement in 1 Cor 3:17. The fact that the guilty party is emphasised as the object of judgement, combined with the lack of any conflicting data that would minimise the danger of this judgement, suggests judgement against temple destroyers as certain. This becomes even more likely when one considers the fact that Paul's presentation of

[153] BDAG, s.v., οὗτος, αὕτη, τοῦτο. Compare this to the similar pattern in Matt 26:23 to draw attention to the one who will betray Jesus: Ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ οὗτός με παραδώσει ("The one who dips his hand in the dish with me, *this very person* will betray me" [my translation]).

[154] Of course, if one reads 1 Cor 3:16–17 as a continuation of the discussion of builders and their work in 1 Cor 3:10–15 then one could also read the assurance of salvation in 1 Cor 3:15 as applicable here. I have already argued at length why I believe this reading is problematic.

judgement in the conditional of 1 Cor 3:17 already suggests that judgement is certain in the event that temple destruction occurs. So, while Paul does not explicitly state that judgement against the temple destroyer is guaranteed and unavoidable, all indicators in 1 Cor 3:16–17 give the impression that it is. In any case, Paul presents it as if it is. In this way, 1 Cor 3:17 is compatible with the inevitable judgement associated with the logic of major metaphysical polllution.

4.7 – Conclusion: Paul's Argument in its Ancient Context

4.7.1 – Paul, Sacrilege, and Major Metaphysical Pollution

It remains now to summarise how 1 Cor 3:16–17 compares with the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution. I argued earlier that, while the specifics can vary, discussions of sacrilege in ancient literature frequently follow a pattern that is closely connected to major metaphysical pollution. I traced cause, effect, terms, and resoluton of pollution in chapter 2. Based on the observations made in this chapter, I conclude that Paul's argument in 1 Cor 3:16–17 follows this pattern and so draws on this logic. Sacrilege is one common cause of major pollution and I urged that Paul discusses the Corinthians' division (which destroys the temple) in ways that seem to reinterpret it as sacrilege. The reinterpretation of a serious offence as an act of sacrilege is common in other ancient literature, and this is a further point of cohesion between Paul and the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution. The most important terms for major metaphysical pollution (ἅγος and ἐναγής) are absent in 1 Corinthians, but they are frequently lacking in other literature as well. The effect of sacrilege in 1 Cor 3:16–17 does not necessarily include the loss of God's Spirit in his temple. Thus, Paul's argument does not betray the concern for maintaining God's presence in the temple found in many OT discussions of moral pollution. Major metaphysical pollution is usually resolved by unavoidable, physical judgement. I demonstrated that the judgement in 1 Cor 3:17 could be taken as a physical

judgement as well, and that there are no hints that it can be avoided. This means that 1 Cor 3:16–17 contains all of the key features of major metaphysical pollution except for the terms, ἅγος and ἐναγής. However, these are unecessary because we are interested in a pattern of thinking rather than a lexical analysis. My analysis of 1 Cor 3:16–17 in light of discussions of sacrilege, pollution, and judgement is summarised below.

Table 7 – 1 Cor 3:16–17 and Major Metaphysical Pollution

Cause	Terms	Effect	Resolution
Destruction of the temple through division, which is presented as sacrilege.	The words ἅγος and ἐναγής are absent, but φθείρω carries connotations of pollution.	Secondary effects are not listed, but there is no indication that God's Spirit will be driven from the temple in response to pollution.	The particular person who destroys the temple is destroyed in turn by God.

4.7.2 – Paul, Jews, and Major Metaphysical Pollution

How does Paul's use of major metaphysical pollution compare with his contemporary Jewish writers? Paul uses this pollution system in a manner consistent with Josephus and Philo in at least three ways. First, Paul uses major metaphysical pollution in the context of judgement. When Josephus and Philo appeal to major metaphysical pollution, they frequently also mention judgement, and so Paul's appeal to these concepts parallels their use. Second, Paul relies on this pollution system to reinterpret an undesirable behaviour (division) as sacrilege. Josephus and Philo both do this as well, particularly when they discuss bloodshed.[155] Third, by reinterpreting division as sacrilege, Paul is able to build a powerful warning against it. Again, both Josephus

[155] Although they do this in slightly different ways. Josephus reinterprets murder of one's kinsmen as sacrilege (*J.W.* 2.469–76), whereas Philo treats murder in general as an act of sacrilege (*Confusion* 31.161; *Moses* 1.314; *Embassy* 10.66; *Decalogue* 25.133; *Spec. Laws* 3.2.18, 3.15.83, 3.20.113).

and Philo make a similar interpretative move to build a case against behaviours they see as deviant.

This comparison between Paul, on the one hand, and Josephus and Philo, on the other, contributes to my thesis in two ways. Most obviously, the fact that other Jews in the first century use major metaphysical pollution makes my reading of Paul historically plausible. What is more, comparison with these writers clarifies why Paul would draw on these concepts in this particular place in his argument. It seems that first century Jews used these concepts to highlight judgement. Major metaphysical pollution provides a flexible resource for dealing with instances of undesirable behaviour and it allows one to construct a warning of judgement that is particular in its target, severe in its consequences, and widely comprehensible in the ancient world.

4.7.3 – The Temple as a Warning

The final question is to consider how this analysis of sacrilege, pollution, and judgement actually shifts the reading of the temple image in 1 Cor 3:16–17. Many scholars, reading Paul in the context of OT temple theology, have taken a system of moral and ritual pollution from the OT and used it as the primary framework within which Paul's temple imagery would operate. This leads to readings that focus on the potential loss of God's presence or on the Corinthian community as the eschatological temple. Paul may well believe that God's Spirit is not guaranteed to remain or that the church is an escahtological temple. However, looking at sacrilege and major metaphyical pollution (both in Jewish and non-Jewish writers) opens up another historically plausible framework within which to read Paul's temple imagery, and one that Jews in the first century did not apparently perceive as incompatible with their use of the OT.

If one reads Paul within this alternative framework of major metaphysical pollution, then the purpose of the temple in this particular argument does shift. Paul is not saying the Corinthians are the temple in order to urge them to live an ethical life, or to teach them that they must work to maintain God's presence, or to inform them that God's promises are being realised in their midst. Instead, he invokes the temple, sacrilege, pollution, and judgement at this juncture to stress for the Corinthians how serious their divisions are and to warn them that, in the same way that crimes against a temple lead to destruction, so their crimes against the community-as-temple are dangerous and lead to destruction. Thus, Paul uses the temple in this passage as a warning against unacceptable behaviour.

CHAPTER 5 – EXEGESIS OF 1 COR 6:19: ΠΟΡΝΕΊΑ AS SACRILEGE

5.1 – Introduction

The previous chapter contained a detailed reading of 1 Cor 3:16–17 with an eye towards whether Paul's use of temple imagery there coheres with the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution. I concluded that Paul's use of the temple in that passage is compatible with major metaphysical pollution, and that it seems Paul is drawing on the key features of that system to make an argument about the danger of division. 1 Cor 6:19 also contains explicit temple language, but in a different argument concerning πορνεία. Is it possible that, even in this different context, Paul draws on major metaphysical pollution when he mentions the temple, and if he does, how would noting this affect our reading of his argument?

I pointed out in the history of interpretation that there is no sustained study of concepts of sacrilege in conversation with Pauline temple imagery. Nonetheless, numerous scholars have suggested, in brief, that πορνεία in 1 Cor 6:18–20 is a form of sacrilege. For example, Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer's commentary, written nearly a century ago, says, "In the temple of Aphrodite at Corinth, πορνεία was regarded as *consecration*: the Corinthians are told here that it is a monstrous *desecration*."[1] R.J. McKelvey claims that sex in the temple (which he views as par for the course in Corinthian temples) "is nothing short of sacrilege, the desecration of God's holy temple."[2] More recently, N.T. Wright declares, "To sin against the body is to deface the

[1] A. Robertson and Plummer 1950, 128.

[2] McKelvey 1969, 103.

divine Temple, to ignore the Shekinah who, in shocking fulfilment of ancient promises, has returned to dwell in that Temple at last."[3] These scholars do not clarify, however, what sacrilege would mean here. What would be the significance of an act of sacrilege against the temple for the Corinthians' bodies? What would it mean for their relationship with the Spirit? Why would it need to be avoided?

Even those scholars who study pollution and transgressions against sacred space have not settled these questions. Yulin Liu, who emphasises Greco-Roman understandings of temple purity and pollution,[4] and Dale Martin, who examines concepts of the body and pollution,[5] provide plentiful data that are relevant to this topic because sacrilege and pollution are closely related. They do not, however, make the connection between sacrilege and pollution in a way that answers these questions concerning 1 Cor 6:18–20. Other scholars analyse Greco-Roman notions of transgressions against sacred space, acts that often overlap with sacrilege, but without delineating kinds of transgressions and their associated consequences.[6]

An analysis of 1 Cor 6:19 in conversation with major metaphysical pollution may help us resolve these questions. In this chapter, I will compare 1 Cor 6:19 with the key features of the system of major metaphysical pollution, asking if there is resonance between the two and considering what that resonance would suggest about the nature of πορνεία, its impact on the body-temple, and Paul's argument against it.

[3] N.T. Wright 2013b, 713.

[4] Liu, 2013.

[5] Martin, 1995.

[6] See especially, Suh 2020. Suh also does not provide any detailed exegesis of 1 Cor 6:19.

This analyis will have six steps. I will first investigate the relationship between 1 Cor 6:19 and other verses in 1 Cor 6. Many scholars read 1 Cor 6:19–20 as if it comprises its own sub-point against πορνεία that is distinct from 1 Cor 6:18. Others connect 1 Cor 6:19 back to earlier verses such as 1 Cor 6:15. Are there any clues in the text, however, that can help us determine how these verses relate with better certainty? The way we understand the relationships between these verses will affect the way we read the flow of Paul's argument and potentially impact the extent to which we find similarities between Paul's use of the temple and the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution.

Once we have clarified how the verses in the latter half of 1 Cor 6 fit together, we can ask if the cause, effect, and resolution of major metaphysical pollution are found in relation to the temple in 1 Cor 6:19. At the outset, I will ask if Paul's presentation of πορνεία looks like sacrilege, that is, if it looks like a cause for major metaphysical pollution. Next, I will ask if the effects of πορνεία include the loss of the Spirit's presence (as might be expected in light of OT concepts of moral pollution), or if Paul's argument seems more closely to mirror some other logic of divine presence in temples and its significance. After this, I will address the resolution of πορνεία's effects through judgement. Judgement is a vital part of the major metaphysical pollution system, but it is not mentioned explicitly in 1 Cor 6. Even so, are there hints that πορνεία causes life-endangering consequences? Are consequences directed at the temple or at the πορνεύων? Finally, I will consider how the argument Paul makes compares to the use of major metaphysical pollution by other writers, including Josephus and Philo.

5.2 – 1 Cor 6:19 in the Context of 1 Cor 6

I begin by examining how 1 Cor 6:19 fits into its context. Establishing the boundaries of this section is vital because many Pauline scholars read the temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19 as is if it

makes essentially the same argument as some other part of 1 Cor 6. For example, Martin Vahrenhorst says of the members of Christ image in 1 Cor 6:15–17, "Die Art dieser Verbindung mit Christus verdeutlicht Paulus im Folgenden durch das Bild von den Gliedern Christi. Es ist für diese Verbindung charakteristisch, dass sie ausschließlichen Charakter hat."[7] He then seems to ignore 1 Cor 6:18 and says instead, "Diesen kulttheologischen Argumentationsfaden greift Paulus in Vers 19 wieder auf, indem er den Leib als Tempel (ναός) des heiligen Geistes bezeichnet."[8] Are there data, however, that can clarify exactly how 1 Cor 6:19 fits into its context?

There are three areas that deserve consideration. First, does verse 18 belong with verse 17? Or does 1 Cor 6:18 signal the beginning of the next sub-point in Paul's argument? Second, does ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε at the beginning of 1 Cor 6:19 mark a logical connection between these verses, or signal a break, or neither? Third, do the imageries of the temple and the slave in 1 Cor 6:19 and 1 Cor 6:20 indicate that all of 1 Cor 6:19–20 makes the same point, or can we discern a distinction in the phases of Paul's argument in these two verses?

5.2.1 – 1 Cor 6:18 in Relation to What Precedes

Many scholars read 1 Cor 6:18 in connection with 1 Cor 6:15–17. Liu, for example, seems to take 1 Cor 6:18 and 1 Cor 6:15 together. "Paul asserts," according to Liu, "that such a violation [an act of prostitution] not only sins against one's body (1 Cor 6:18), but also is an offense against Christ's body (1 Cor 6:15)."[9] Brian Rosner's interpretation of sinning against the body in 1 Cor 6:18 makes no mention of 1 Cor 6:19–20, instead seeking to clarify 1 Cor 6:18 by appeal

[7] Vahrenhorst 2008, 170.

[8] Vahrenhorst 2008, 170–71.

[9] Liu 2013, 159.

to 1 Cor 6:16. He claims πορνεία is "a sin against the ongoing well being of the body. *This position reads 6:18 in the light of 6:16a* ('do you not know that he who joins himself to a harlot becomes one body [with her]'), and with Genesis 2:24 (6:16b; 'the two shall become one flesh),' in mind."[10] There are, two features of this text, however, that could indicate a shift at 1 Cor 6:18 such that we should take 6:18 as the beginning of a new sub-section of Paul's argument.

The first feature is a change in the content under discussion from 1 Cor 6:15–17 to 1 Cor 6:18. In the former three verses, the argument revolves around the union between Christ and the Corinthians' bodies. Paul begins with the rhetorical question: οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἐστιν. This initial proposition governs the following argument as Paul makes the case that, since the Corinthians' bodies are members of Christ, one should not unite those bodies with a πόρνη. This union is problematic, according to 1 Cor 6:16–17, because intercourse with a πόρνη makes one body with her, but the Corinthians are one spirit with the Lord.[11] In 1 Cor 6:18, on the other hand, several key features of 1 Cor 6:15–17 disappear completely. There is no more discussion of μέλη or talk of union with the Lord or with a πόρνη. Instead, new elements are introduced, the most prominent being the discussion of πορνεία as a sin. This addition of sin language is new not only in comparison to 1 Cor 6:15–17, but, in fact, it is new in comparison with the letter of 1 Corinthians as a whole. 1 Cor 6:18 is the first time in 1 Corinthians that Paul

[10] Rosner 1994, 144 (emphasis mine to highlight the connection posited between 1 Cor 6:18 and 1 Cor 6:16).

[11] The relationship between 1 Cor 6:15 and 1 Cor 6:16–17 is made clear by the use of οὐκ οἴδατε following μὴ γένοιτο. As I noted before, when οὐκ οἴδατε follows μὴ γένοιτο in Paul's letters it introduces the reason that Paul rejects a false conclusion. Although Conzelmann 1975, 111, does not offer any analysis of οὐκ οἴδατε following μὴ γένοιτο in his discussion of these verses, he nonetheless rightly notes that the rhetorical question in 1 Cor 6:15 is "grounded on what follows."

uses any sin language at all.[12] The discussion also shifts from the effects of union with a πόρνη on the union with Christ to the effects of πορνεία on one's own body. These data indicate a shift in focus at 1 Cor 6:18 that makes a distinction between 1 Cor 6:17 and 1 Cor 6:18 possible.

The lack of connective tissue to connect 1 Cor 6:17 with 1 Cor 6:18 also makes a break between these verses possible. There are many instances in 1 Cor 6 where an inferential conjunction or other discourse marker clearly constrains and defines the relationship between various pieces of Paul's argument.[13] Lacking such a connecting conjunction in 1 Cor 6:18 means we are not compelled to posit any particular relationship between 1 Cor 6:17 and 1 Cor 6:18. What is more, asyndeton can be used in Paul's writing to indicate a sharp change in topic. This is the case in, for example, 1 Cor 6:1 and 1 Cor 6:12. One could make the case that the phrase φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν works here in 1 Cor 6:18 to mark a summary of previous material because a similar phrase (φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας) is used in this manner in 1 Cor 10:14. This is suggested by Albert Hogeterp, who reads 1 Cor 6:18–20 as a concluding rhetorical unit concerning πορνεία in part because of the parallel language in 1 Cor 10:14.[14] While Hogeterp is correct to note these similarities in language, it is also vital to recognise that the inferential conjunction, διόπερ, is lacking in 1 Cor 6:18, and so the relationship between 1 Cor 6:18 and

[12] I.e., ἁμαρτία, ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμάρτημα, ἁμαρτωλός. The potential significance of introducing the language of sin here is generally overlooked, and scholars sometimes talk about earlier sections of the letter using sin language even though such language is not used in those sections. Rosner 1994, 61, for example, describes the expulsion formula in 1 Cor 5:13 as "the command to evict the sinner," even though πορνεία is nowhere in 1 Cor 5 described as a sin.

[13] E.g., δέ in 1 Cor 6:13 and 14; γάρ in 1 Cor 6:16 and 6:20; etc.

[14] Hogeterp 2006, 337, says, "Cf. the analogy with διόπερ, ἀγαπητοί μου, φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας in 1 Cor 10:14, which recapitulates previous exhortations against aspects of idol worship, that is, food offered to idols in 1 Cor 8:1-13 and temptations in 1 Cor 10:1-13." For a different approach to this phrase that posits connections to the LXX and *Testament of Reuben*, see Rosner 1992; 1994, 123–46; Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 262–63.

what precedes is not marked as it is in 1 Cor 10:14. Given these data, it seems possible that there is a break between 1 Cor 6:17 and 1 Cor 6:18.

The combination of a change in content between 1 Cor 6:15–17 and 1 Cor 6:18 and asyndeton in 1 Cor 6:18 makes it possible that 1 Cor 6:18 marks a break from the argument in 1 Cor 6:15–17. If this is true, then we are justified in looking more closely at 1 Cor 6:18–20 as a section of the argument that does not make the same points as what precedes it. I have provided, however, only the first step in my study. Even if 1 Cor 6:18 is unambiguously a new section of Paul's argument, this does not guarantee that 1 Cor 6:19 is part of this same new section.

5.2.2 – The Connection Between 1 Cor 6:18 and 1 Cor 6:19

Many scholars either do not comment on the way that 1 Cor 6:18 and 1 Cor 6:19 are related, or else they claim that the two are different sections of Paul's argument that are not bound by any particular, logical connection. For example, Philip Richardson offers a close reading of 1 Cor 6:12–18, but when he reaches 1 Cor 6:19 he begins, "I come now to the next figurative temple reference" without explaining precisely how that reference relates to the previous verse(s).[15] Other scholars more explicitly deny that 1 Cor 6:18 and 1 Cor 6:19 should be taken together, instead reading a break at 1 Cor 6:19. Bruce Fisk argues, "The final unit, vv. 19–20, shows little sign of direct dependence upon vv. 16–18."[16] He goes on to specify why he believes this to be the case: "There are no signs that the interpretive key to v. 18c is withheld until v. 19, to the

[15] Richardson 2018, 178 and cf. Martin 1995, who likewise never clarifies in this work how he thinks 1 Cor 6:19 is related to 1 Cor 6:18. Daly 1978, 61, cites both 1 Cor 6:19 and 1 Cor 6:15 together as examples of texts containing temple imagery, as if it is these two verses that are mostly closely related in 1 Cor 6, but he provides no further comment to explain his decision to do so.

[16] Fisk 1996, 557.

effect that sinning against 'his own body' really means sinning 'against the Spirit.'"[17] Jan Lambrecht claims, "V. 19 is connected to the preceding verse by ἤ ('or'). Yet what follows does not properly belong to the same reasoning as that in v. 18 . . . Paul rather comes back to the idea that the Christians are united with the Lord (vv. 15–17)."[18]

The use of ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε, however, normally signals a logical connection between what precedes it and what follows in Paul's letters.[19] If we read 1 Cor 6:18–19 as if the same pattern holds true here, then the argument unfolds as follows:

Statement: "Shun fornication! Every sin that a person commits is outside the body, but the fornicator sins against the body itself" (1 Cor 6:18)

Reason why this is problematic: "Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God, and that you are not your own?" (1 Cor 6:19)[20]

In other words, sin against the body must be avoided because sinning against the body is also sinning against the temple. Both Fisk and Lambrecht may find this reading unsatisfactory because they read 1 Cor 6:19 as if it is about a kind of union with the divine, the same topic as 1 Cor 6:15–17, and their articles do not consider whether there is special significance to sinning against a temple. This question will be addressed later, but for now, against Fisk's contention

[17] Fisk 1996, 557.

[18] Lambrecht 2009, 484.

[19] I noted in the previous chapter that οὐκ οἴδατε appears in Paul's writings in three different patterns. It can appear standing alone, it can appear immediately following μὴ γένοιτο, and it can appear following ἤ. Each pattern signals a different kind of relationship between what precedes and what follows, except for οὐκ οἴδατε standing alone, which does not clarify the relationship.

[20] So, rightly, Fee 1987, 263: "The tie to what has immediately preceded is achieved with the conjunction 'or' (again omitted from the NIV)."

that "There are no signs that the interpretive key to v. 18c is withheld until v. 19,"[21] I argue that the use of ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε should at least alert us to the possibility that these two verses are connected more closely than is often accepted.

I have so far made two points. I have suggested that 1 Cor 6:18 marks a break from 1 Cor 6:15–17. I have also argued that 1 Cor 6:18 is connected logically to 1 Cor 6:19 by the use of ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε, and so the two verses go together. This means we can, at the least, begin to look more closely at 1 Cor 6:18 along with 1 Cor 6:19. One final question remains, however: should we now examine 1 Cor 6:18–20 together as the last part of the argument in chapter 6, or are there distinctions between the points made in this section?

5.2.3 – From Temple to Slave: 1 Cor 6:19b–20

Pauline scholars frequently work with 1 Cor 6:18–20 without clarifying how they understand the relationship between what may be distinct pieces of the argument, and they can sometimes blend material from both halves of this section together. This is the case, for example, for Hogeterp, who describes 1 Cor 6:18–20 "as a concluding rhetorical unit on the issue of πορνεία, which in my view comprises all previous connotations given to it by Paul."[22] While I do agree that 1 Cor 6:18–20 concludes the πορνεία discussion, Hogeterp does not specify how the verses in this unit relate to each other, or whether he discerns multiple points within this unit. This approach lacks clarity in its description of how, precisely, the temple is being used in the argument.

To be sure, it is understandable to read 1 Cor 6:18–20 together. There is no clear sign of a shift or development in topic (e.g., there is no δέ). Moreover, the καί in the middle of verse 19

[21] Fisk 1996, 557.

[22] Hogeterp 2006, 336.

brings 1 Cor 6:19a and 1 Cor 6:19b together. Nonetheless, there are good reasons to reconsider whether 1 Cor 6:19–20 makes one or two distinct points. The first reason is the presence of καί. This word is usually translated as "and," but does its presence sufficiently clarify the relationship between these two groups of verses for us to know if they deal with the same point? The next issue is the use of γάρ in 1 Cor 6:20. It could mark material that further supports both the use of the temple in 1 Cor 6:19a and the statement that the Corinthians are not their own in 1 Cor 6:19b, in which case, it would seem that 1 Cor 6:19 is making one point that is then substantiated by 1 Cor 6:20. On the other hand, it could mark material that supports only 1 Cor 6:19b, in which case 1 Cor 6:19b would seem to contain a different point from 1 Cor 6:19a. To address this ambiguity, I will look at whether the content of 1 Cor 6:20 can make sense as an explanation of both 1 Cor 6:19a and 1 Cor 6:19b, or only 1 Cor 6:19b. Third, I will address the relationship between being "bought with a price" and the temple. Is there some cultic overtone to the imagery of buying in 1 Cor 6:20 such that it likely relates to the temple image, or does this language indicate a shift from temple imagery to a different kind of imagery? Finally, I will consider glorifying God in 1 Cor 6:20. Does this call to glorify God in the body make better sense of the buying imagery in 1 Cor 6:19b–20 than of the temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19a, or does it fit with both temple and buying imagery?

5.2.3.1 – The Use of Καί Between 1 Cor 6:19a and 1 Cor 6:19b

Dealing first with καί in 1 Cor 6:19, I note that this word does not clarify precisely whether 1 Cor 6:19a (ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός ἐστιν, οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ) and 6:19b (οὐκ ἐστὲ ἑαυτῶν) are part of the same point, or whether they are two separate points that are closely related. Lambrecht rightly notes the ambiguity of these verses when he comments "It is uncertain whether the next clause 'and you are not your own' . . . still depends

on 'do you not know.'"[23] This ambiguity is evident in an analysis of various bible translations at this verse. Several translations treat the καί as a conjunctive. This is seen in both the NRSV ("which you have from God, and that you are not your own") and the NKJV ("whom you have from God, and you are not your own"). Other translations treat the material in 1 Cor 6:19b as the start of a new sentence. The NIV, for example, renders 1 Cor 6:19–20: "Do you not know that your bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit, who is in you, whom you have received from God? You are not your own; you were bought at a price. Therefore honor God with your bodies."[24] Still others treat the καί as an inferential conjunction. In N.T. Wright's translation of the NT, he renders 1 Cor 6:19 as, "Or don't you know that your body is a temple of the holy spirit within you, the spirit God gave you, *so that* you don't belong to yourselves?"[25]

The reason for this inconsistency in translation lies in the nature of the καί. This word marks two items (in this case, two propositions) as being closely related and equally important. As Steven Runge makes clear, "καί signals the reader to more closely associate the connected elements" and "The use of the connective represents the writer's choice to 'add' the one element to the other,"[26] but it does not "mark the presence or absence of semantic continuity."[27] In this case, καί suggests that we take both 1 Cor 6:19a and 1 Cor 6:19b as part of the broader argument against πορνεία. However, beyond this, it does not tell us whether the two parts of this verse

[23] Lambrecht 2009, 484.

[24] Likewise, the ESV and RSV treat "You are not your own" as the start of a new sentence.

[25] N.T. Wright 2011 (emphasis mine).

[26] Runge 2010, 25.

[27] Runge 2010, 24.

make the same point or whether καί is indicating an, e.g., ascensive, contrastive, or conjunctive[28] relationship between these parts of the verse. Determining these details depends on contextual clues.

Although the presence of καί does not sufficiently clarify the relationship between 1 Cor 6:19a and 1 Cor 6:19b, there remain a number of contextual factors that can help us make a decision about how to read these verses. In the next section, I will turn to the first of these, the clause introduced by γάρ in 1 Cor 6:20. I will ask whether this clause can work as an explanation of both 1 Cor 6:19a and 1 Cor 6:19b, or only one of them. This will partially illuminate whether we are dealing with two separate points in this verse.

5.2.3.2 – "Bought With a Price" and Its Relationship to 1 Cor 6:19

Many scholars, including several in my history of interpretation like R.J. McKelvey, treat 1 Cor 6:20 (ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς· δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν) as if it relates clearly to both elements (namely, the temple and the claim that the Corinthians are not their own) in 1 Cor 6:19.[29] But how could we know this? The ambiguity presented by these verses stems partly from the nature of the grammar. It is generally accepted that γάρ introduces explanatory material that expands previous content, but the presence of this word, without further analysis of the context, does not determine how far back the material being explained reaches, or indeed, how far forward the explanation stretches.[30]

---

[28] To borrow language from Wallace 1996, 670.

[29] McKelvey 1969, 104. He says of 1 Cor 6:19–20, "Very naturally Paul adds that the Christian is God's possession, bought at a price."

[30] Some of the passages cited in Runge's discussion illustrate just how ambiguous γάρ can be. In Matt 10:19 (μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς ἢ τί λαλήσητε· δοθήσεται γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τί λαλήσητε) the material introduced by γάρ appears to relate only to the immediately preceding clause. However, in Gal 5:13 (Ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, ἀδελφοί· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις) Runge

So, we must consider the content of 1 Cor 6:20 and ask whether it could conceivably provide an explanation for the content of 1 Cor 6:19a and 1 Cor 6:19b, or only one of them. Beginning with 1 Cor 6:19a, does telling the Corinthians that they were bought with a price provide any logical explanation for why they are God's temple, filled with God's Spirit? The buying of the temple is not a theme of either the OT or NT. Neither Solomon's temple nor the second temple were made God's through a ritual of purchase, nor did God's Spirit come to inhabit the temple by means of God's buying of that temple.[31] It seems unlikely, therefore, that 1 Cor 6:20 offers an explanation as to why the Corinthians are God's temple, indwelled by the Holy Spirit.

On the other hand, the content of 1 Cor 6:20 does make sense as an explanation for the statement: "you are not your own," in 1 Cor 6:19b. This is because ἀγοράζω is often associated with the purchase of slaves, a group of people whose bodies were, quite literally, not their own. Paul uses ἀγοράζω in precisely this way in 1 Cor 7. He notes that the one who was called while free becomes a slave (δοῦλος) in the Lord. He then repeats his affirmation from 1 Cor 6:20 that the Corinthians were bought with a price and commands them not to become slaves of human beings (δοῦλοι ἀνθρώπων).[32] The use of ἀγοράζω in the context of buying slaves is also found outside of the Bible in other Greek literature. For example, Diodorus Siculus provides a story in which a man buys (ἀγοράζω) a large number of slaves (δουλικός) and brands their bodies (σῶμα)

claims that the material following γάρ relates to all of Gal 5:1–12. See Runge 2010, 53–54. On the use of γάρ in an explanatory sense, cf. Porter 1999, 207–8.

[31] There are texts in which someone buys (ἀγοράζω) material to be used in the rebuilding of Jerusalem (2 Chron 34:11) but this is not the same thing. There are also other texts in which God's people are purchased (e.g., 2 Pet 2:1; Rev 5:9, 14:3–4) but again, the act of purchasing is not constitutive of a temple in these passages.

[32] Although in 1 Cor 7:23 the word order is τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε rather than ἠγοράσθητε τιμῆς as in 1 Cor 6:20.

to mark their enslaved status.[33] The fact that ἀγοράζω is used both in 1 Corinthians and elsewhere in Greek literature to describe the purchase of slaves whose bodies belong to a new master makes this reading plausible here as well. This reading would make sense as an explanation for why the Corinthians are not their own.

These observations suggest that the material of 1 Cor 6:20 set off by γάρ does not adequately provide an explanation for the statement made in 1 Cor 6:19a, but that it can explain the statement in 1 Cor 6:19b. If I am correct, then it seems likely that 1 Cor 6:19a and 1 Cor 6:19b are making separate points and that 1 Cor 6:20 provides further information about the latter point only. Even so, there are two other elements of 1 Cor 6:18–20 that merit attention because they often lead scholars to treat the temple and slave imagery as one. These elements are the relationship between the temple and the manumission of slaves, and the connection between temple and glory.

5.2.3.3 – Sacral Manumission and the Temple

There is a longstanding view in Pauline scholarship that the slave image in 1 Cor 6:20 is connected to the temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19. This view originates with Adolf Deissmann, who believes some sort of customary sacral manumission lies behind Paul's argument in these verses. He comes to this conclusion by examining inscriptions that discuss the sale of a slave to a god. One example he provides reads as follows: "Apollo the Pythian *bought* from Sosibius of Amphiss, *for freedom*, a female slave, whose name is Nicaea, by race a Roman, *with a price* of

[33] Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 34.2.36.

three minae of silver and a half-minae."[34] Deissmann calls this the "solemn rite of fictitious purchase of the slave by some divinity," and claims it results in a slave who is "now the property of the god . . . he is a completely free man."[35]

Deissmann's thesis is significant because it can be picked up by scholars working on 1 Cor 6:19–20, and this can cause them to read the imagery of the slave who is bought with a price in connection with the image of the temple. A prominent example, and one relevant for this thesis because of his work on the temple, is the work of McKelvey. He says "Very naturally Paul adds that the Christian is God's possession, bought at a price. The figure is that of redemption, probably sacral manumission, and suits the temple image well."[36] Similarly, Rosner cites C.K. Barrett with approval for connecting the imagery of 1 Cor 6:19–20 to the "process of sacral manumission,"[37] although he pushes for a closer connection to the OT than Deissmann does.

Deissmann's work is fascinating, but his thesis concerning sacral manumission and its relevance for 1 Corinthians has been found wanting. Scholars such as S. Scott Bartchy and Martin correctly point out that ἀγοράζω is not used in the context of sacral manumission, but rather to discuss the selling of a slave from one owner to another.[38] The usual word for sacral

[34] Deissmann 1929, 323 (emphasis original). The Greek texts reads: ἐπρίατο ὁ Ἀπόλλων ὁ Πύθιος παρά Ζωσιβίου Ἀμφισσέος ἐπ'ἐλευθερίαι σῶμ[α] γυναυκεῖον, ἅι ὄνομα Νίκαια, τὸ γένος Ῥωμαίαν, τιμᾶς αργυρίου μνᾶν τριῶν καὶ ἡμιμναίου.

[35] Deissmann 1929, 322.

[36] McKelvey 1969, 104.

[37] Rosner 1994, 134–35, citing Barrett 1971, 152. Barrett actually considers whether there is a break in 1 Cor 6:19, but ultimately sees 1 Cor 6:19b as a development of the same point from 1 Cor 6:19a because he thinks it is unlikely that Paul would start a new sentence with καί.

[38] Bartchy 1973, 124, n. 449; Martin 1990, 63.

manumission is πρίαμαι, a word that does not appear in the Bible with reference to selling slaves, to a deity or otherwise.[39] As Martin summarises,

> Most scholars have agreed that Deissmann's explanation of *buy (agorazein)* to mean redemption *from* slavery by way of sacral manumission must be rejected. *Priasthai,* not *agorazein,* is the word most commonly used in those contexts. *Agorazein* refers not to the sale of a slave to a god by which the slave is actually freed, but to the ordinary sale of a slave by one owner to another owner.[40]

I have now suggested that one of the elements that causes scholars to read the temple and slave imagery together lacks justification. The language used in 1 Cor 6:19b–20 is not the language of sacral manumission, and so the connection between 1 Cor 6:19a and 1 Cor 6:19b–20 sometimes posited by Pauline scholars on the basis of sacral manumission is tenuous. One final issue remains: the relationship between glory and the content of 1 Cor 6:19–20. I will ask in the next section if the command to glorify God in the body fits with the image of the slave and the image of the temple, or only the image of the slave.

5.2.3.4 – Glorify God in the Body

Paul concludes 1 Cor 6 with the emphatic particle, δή,[41] and the command to glorify God in the body. Many scholars link this command to glorify God in 1 Cor 6:20 to the temple in 1 Cor 6:19. Gordon Fee says "The final imperative flows directly out of the argument from the two preceding images."[42] Roy Ciampa and Brian Rosner suggest Paul's closing command "arises out

[39] This word appears in the LXX to indicate rather routine transactions such as the buying of grain in the story of Joseph (Gen 42:2–3, 42:10, 43:2, 43:20) or the buying of a field (Prov 29:34).

[40] Martin 1990, 63.

[41] So Brookins and Longenecker 2016, 149, who suggest it "strengthens the command" that follows. The word may also carry an inferential quality, and so is sometimes translated as "therefore" (as in the NRSV).

[42] Fee 1987, 265.

of both the temple (v. 19) and slavery (v. 20a) fields of meaning he has just evoked."[43] Christfried Böttrich claims, "Die Tempelmetapher wird dabei mit der Absicht eingesetzt, die vorausgegangene Argumentation zusammenzufassen und die Schlußmahnung vorzubereiten: 'Verherrlicht also auch Gott mit eurem Leib.'"[44] These scholars all believe the temple image in 1 Cor 6:19a is closely associated with the call to glorify God in 1 Cor 6:20, but the connection to the temple is not as clear is it first appears.

While the temple is certainly associated with God's glory in the LXX and the NT, it is not the temple that does the glorifying. More often, the temple is the thing being glorified. Sometimes this glory comes from people.[45] Other times the temple is glorified by God (the reverse of how some scholars read 1 Cor 6:19–20).[46] In still other texts the temple is *filled with* God's glory.[47] These texts that mention glory in association with temple do not, however, indicate that the temple glorifies God. The idea that the temple glorifies God, then, does not seem to be a biblical theme that Paul would pick up and then apply to the Corinthians here in this letter.[48]

---

[43] Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 266.

[44] Böttrich 1999, 419.

[45] E.g., 1 Chron 22:5: "For David said, 'My son Solomon is young and inexperienced, and the house that is to be built for the Lord must be exceedingly magnificent, famous and glorified throughout all lands; I will therefore make preparation for it.' So David provided materials in great quantity before his death." Cf. 1 Macc 15:9; 1 Esdra 8:25; etc.

[46] Isa 60:7: "All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered to you, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister to you; they shall be acceptable on my altar, and I will glorify my glorious house."

[47] E.g., 3 Kgdms 8:11: "so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud; for the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord." Cf. Isa 6:1; 2 Chron 5:13–14; etc.

[48] The pattern is broadly similar outside of the Bible in other ancient Greco-Roman literature as well. There are several texts in which a temple is glorified by people, e.g., in Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 4.83.3, where the temple of Aphrodite is the object of δόξα, evidenced by the number of votive offerings it receives, the number of sacrifices given there, etc. (cf. Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.3.30). At the same time, even though the temple is sometimes the object of glory in extra-biblical Greco-Roman literature, glorifying the gods is not commonly described in this literature. Carey Newman even goes so far as to claim: "*δόξα and δοξάζω are never used in reference to a god, or the*

On the other hand, the concept of a slave (the topic of 1 Cor 6:19b and into 1 Cor 6:20) glorifying his or her master does have precedent in biblical literature. In Mal 1:6 God asks, "A son honors (δοξάζω) his father, and servants (δοῦλος) their master. If then I am a father, where is the honor (δόξα) due me?" This imagery suggests that, as a slave honours his or her master, so should Israel honour God. This argument bears similarities to 1 Cor 6:20 where the Corinthians, who have been bought by God, are commanded to honour their new master. The call to glorify God in the body therefore seems to flow from the immediately previous material concerning slaves whose bodies belong to God more naturally than it flows from the image of the temple. My point here is not to distance the concepts of temple and glory altogether. Rather, I suggest that since glorifying God seems to flow more naturally from 1 Cor 6:19b than from 1 Cor 6:19a, it seems possible that the image of the temple and the image of the slave work as two different sections in Paul's argument against πορνεία.

5.2.4 – Summary

I have now considered a variety of data points that could indicate a shift in the argument from 1 Cor 6:17 to 1 Cor 6:18, that could mark a connection between 1 Cor 6:18 and 1 Cor 6:19, and that hint the point in 1 Cor 6:19b–20 is not the same as the one made in 1 Cor 6:18–19a. In light of the data presented above, I conclude 1 Cor 6:18–19a should be taken together as a complete and distinct point in Paul's argument against πορνεία. My understanding of how these verses are divided is summarised in the chart below.

---

gods, in the Greco-Roman world. Δόξα language simply does not figure in Greek devotion to the gods" (Newman 2019, 3). See also the fuller discussion of glory in Newman 1992, as well as the more recent discussions of glory in Romans by Blackwell 2010 and Jackson 2018.

Table 8 – The Shape of 1 Corinthians 6:15–20	
Verse Reference	**Topic**
6:15–17	Avoid πορνεία because of your union with Christ
6:18–19a	Avoid πορνεία because the body is temple
6:19b–20	Avoid πορνεία because the body is God's possession

If 1 Cor 6:18–19a contains a distinct phase of Paul's argument, then this provides parameters that guide our analysis of temple imagery in comparison with major metaphysical pollution. Paul's use of temple imagery, if my reading of these verses is correct, is clarified primarily by the context of 1 Cor 6:18 rather than the other verses in this chapter. Having established where I see the division of arguments in 1 Cor 6:15–20, I am now able to work more closely with the argument in 1 Cor 6:18–19a, the sub-section where the image of the temple stands. In the next section, I will proceed to analyse Paul's use of temple imagery in light of the cause, effect, and resolution of major metaphysical pollution.

5.3 – Sacrilege and Sin Against the Temple in 1 Cor 6:18–19a

The first step in comparing Paul's temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19 with the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution is to look at whether Paul is presenting as πορνεία as sacrilege, that is, as a cause of pollution. One way we can do this is to consider the target of sin in 1 Cor 6:18–19a. If 1 Cor 6:18 and 1 Cor 6:19 are connected as I suggest they are, this topic must be revisited. The next step is to look at how sin language is used in relation to temples in discussions of sacrilege that follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution. Does sin in, towards, or against a temple indicate sacrilege? Finally, we can ask if there is precedent for

viewing sexual sin as sacrilegious. Examining these three areas can clarify whether Paul is presenting πορνεία in a way that parallels the ways deviant behaviours are presented as sacrilege in other ancient literature.

5.3.1 – Clarifying the Object of Sin

Against what does the sexually immoral person sin in 1 Cor 6:18? On the one hand, this person sins against the body (ὁ δὲ πορνεύων εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἁμαρτάνει). On the other hand, are there signs that sinning against the body has greater significance that it seems at first glance? In the previous chapter, I noted that the presence of ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε in 1 Cor 6:19 signals that the content of 1 Cor 6:19 substantiates the claim made in 1 Cor 6:18. If this reading of the function of ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε is accurate, then functions as follows:

> *Statement:* "Shun fornication! Every sin that a person commits is outside the body, but the fornicator sins against the body itself" (1 Cor 6:18)
>
> *Reason why this is problematic:* "Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God, and that you are not your own?" (1 Cor 6:19)

The significant piece for this thesis lies in the logic by which 1 Cor 6:18–19 operates. Paul's argument suggests that if the Corinthians knew their bodies were temples, then they would not be willing to sin against them. Sin against the body (ἁμαρτάνω εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα) is problematic in part because it is also sin against a temple (ἁμαρτάνω εἰς ναὸς).[49] The question then arises: what does it mean to sin against the temple? Is there special significance to this kind

[49] Fee 1987, 261, rightly notes this relationship: "With yet another 'Or do you not know that?' Paul gives theological justification for the prohibition of v. 18a and theological explanation of v. 18bc."

of sin, and does it indicate an act of sacrilege in texts that follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution? To answer this question, we must turn to the use of ἁμαρτάνω εἰς language in Greek literature.

5.3.2 – Sinning Against the Temple

Scholars have long debated exactly what is at stake in 1 Cor 6:18–19, especially since Paul makes the statement that, in contrast to other sins that are outside the body, πορνεία is a sin against the body. The difficulties of these verses have led several scholars to argue that 1 Cor 6:18b (πᾶν ἁμάρτημα ὃ ἐὰν ποιήσῃ ἄνθρωπος ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν) represents not Paul's words, but a Corinthian slogan to which Paul responds in 1 Cor 6:18c.[50] This proposal appeared first in William Conybeare and John Howson,[51] and was later championed by, in particular, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor.[52] Scholars such as Robert Gundry push back against this view, arguing that 1 Cor 6:18b does not seem like a probable Corinthian position, and that Paul's response in 1 Cor 6:18c does not look like a compelling answer to them. He claims, "Since they [the Corinthians] would rather have put sin on the side of the physical body and dissociated the true 'I' (consisting in the spirit) from the body with its sin, a slogan from them would more

[50] Finding a slogan in 1 Corinthians is, of course, common. Brookins 2014, 92, provides a table detailing the commentaries that identify a slogan in each of the contested passages in 1 Corinthians, and every single commentary he includes posits at least one slogan somewhere in 1 Corinthians. The 20 commentators Brookins analyses include: Lietzmann 1969; Barrett 1971; Conzelmann 1975; Murphy-O'Connor 1979; Fee 1987; Senft 1990; Lang 1994; Witherington 1995; Wolff 1996; Hays 1997; Kremer 1997; Horsley 1998; Collins 1999; Lindemann 2000; Thiselton 2000; Talbert 2002; Garland 2003; Fitzmyer 2008; Schrage 2008; Ciampa and Rosner 2010. See also Hurd 1965, 68, for a similar but now dated analysis of slogans and the scholars who find them in 1 Corinthians.

Scholars who see a slogan in 1 Cor 6:18 include Miguens 1975; Murphy-O'Connor 1978; Burk 2008; Smith 2008; 2010; Lambrecht 2009; Brookins and Longenecker 2016, 148; Naselli 2017; Richardson 2018, 174–75.

[51] Conybeare and Howson 1874, 2:43. Cf. Moule 1953, 196–97.

[52] Murphy-O'Connor 1978. See also his updated essay in Murphy-O'Connor 2009, ch. 3.

naturally have read, 'Every sin . . . is outside the *spirit*.'"[53] He is followed by Brendan Byrne and, recently, Jonathan Robinson.[54] Even proponents of the slogan position sometimes concede this point. Murphy-O'Connor says that in 6:18c Paul does not provide a well-reasoned response to 6:18b, but simply affirms the opposite. He then remarks with disappointment, "It is unfortunately typical of Paul that he consistently refuses to enter the thought-world of those in the community who disagreed with him."[55] These scholars have not considered, however, the possible significance of sin-against-the-temple language in ancient literature and its similarity to Paul's language here. Is there special significance to this language, and if there is, does this reveal anything about how Paul and his audience may share in a particular "thought-world" related to certain concepts of sacrilege?

In several texts, the language of sinning against a temple (ἁμαρτάνω εἰς) indicates sacrilege that is then linked to physically realised, divine judgement, in a pattern consistent with major metaphysical pollution. I mentioned a story related by Appian in which certain soldiers enter a temple of Apollo against the commands of their officers and desecrate it by robbing it and by mutilating and stealing the golden image of the god.[56] When Appian revisits this sacrilegious event later in the narrative, he refers to the sacrilegious individuals as men who sin against the temple of Apollo (τῶν ἐς τὸ Ἀπολλώνιον ἁμαρτόντων).[57] These men are, predictably, excluded from the plunder of Carthage for their sacrilegious crimes. Similarly, Pseudo-Plutarch relates a

[53] Gundry 1976, 74.

[54] Byrne 1983, 609–10 (and following him, Garland 2003, 236); J. R. Robinson 2018, 165.

[55] Murphy-O'Connor 2009, 31.

[56] Appian, *Roman History* 8.1.127.

[57] Appian, *Roman History* 8.1.133.

story in which a man named Andocides is accused of sacrilege (ἀσέβεια), because it is believed that he took part in the mutilation of the statue of Hermes and the desecration of the mysteries of Demeter.[58] As in the narrative from Appian, Pseudo-Plutarch uses ἁμαρτάνω εἰς language to mark the sacrilegious crimes against the mysteries (εἰς τὰ τῆς Δήμητρος ἁμαρτὼν μυστήρια)[59] and against what are either temples or holy objects that reside in and are in the service of temples (τοὺς περὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἁμαρτόντας).[60] Although Andocides avoids a guilty verdict himself, those who are found guilty are put to death, in keeping with a common response to sacrilege.[61]

The data presented above suggest that there is special significance to sinning against a temple. To say that someone sins against a temple is one way to indicate that the person has committed a sacrilegious crime and to activate the logic of major metaphysical pollution. Acknowledging these data leads me to three conclusions. First, I noted earlier that ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε frequently signals that the material preceding it is logically connected to the material following it. This section concerning sin-against-the-temple language reveals that the argument that emerges in 1 Cor 6:18–19a if we allow ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε to connect these verses is an argument that has attestation in other ancient literature. This makes it more plausible that we should consider 1 Cor 6:18–19a together. Second, given these data, Paul's response to the Corinthians in 6:18c–19 (if 6:18b is indeed a slogan) could be compelling to his Greco-Roman audience, in contrast to the conclusions of Murphy-O'Connor, because it coheres with the way many other ancient people

[58] Pseudo-Plutarch, [*Vit. X. orat.* 2.834.C–E]. Whether the mysteries are the rites performed in the worship of Demeter or whether they are sacred implements related to that worship or located within a sacred space is unclear from this text.

[59] Pseudo-Plutarch, [*Vit. X. orat.* 2.834.D].

[60] Pseudo-Plutarch, [*Vit. X. orat.* 2.834.E]. See Petrovic and Petrovic 2016, 51, who say "The Greek word ἱερός, usually translated as 'sacred', marks out all things that are in some way associated with the gods."

[61] Pseudo-Plutarch, [*Vit. X. orat.* 2.834.E].

talked about sacrilegious, and therefore dangerous, acts. Third, since sin-against-the-temple language is often used to indicate sacrilege and activate the logic of major metaphysical pollution, Paul's argument in 1 Cor 6:18–19a does present πορνεία in a way that makes it look like an act of sacrilege.

5.3.3 – Presenting Πορνεία as Sacrilege

One possible obstacle to the idea that Paul is casting πορνεία as sacrilege in a way that resonates with the logic of major metaphysical pollution is that many scholars think a link between sex acts and pollution is restricted to a specifically Jewish understanding of temples. Some scholars raise this issue to challenge supposed similarities between Jewish and Greco-Roman concepts of temples and sex, not least in relation to 1 Cor 6:19. This is another example of the Jewish/Greco-Roman dichotomy that is found so often in Pauline scholarship. For example, Hogeterp, argues that, "Paul's application of the metaphor of God's Temple to the body that is free from sexual immorality cannot be explained from this Graeco-Roman context," and so, "We will therefore have to turn to traditions in contemporary Judaism and Christian Judaism to find out whether and how Paul's temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19 . . . may have appealed to the Corinthians."[62] Hogeterp has trouble accepting similarities between 1 Cor 6:19 and patterns found in pagan literature because he thinks an opposition between the temple and πορνεία is alien to pagan thought.

As I noted before in my chapter on major metaphysical pollution, however, sex in a sacred space such as a temple is commonly called sacrilege and commonly creates major metaphysical pollution in ancient literature even outside of Jewish contexts.[63] So, since Paul is

[62] Hogeterp 2006, 343.

[63] I have previously cited texts such as Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 8.144 and Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 51.8.3 in this regard.

building on language and concepts that are frequently indicative of sacrilege (i.e., the idea of sinning against the temple) and in relation to something (sex) that is often called sacrilege, it is perfectly plausible that he is drawing from concepts of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution and we need not suppose a disjunction between the framework within which a first-century Jew and a first-century non-Jew might interpret the polluting power of sex in sacred spaces.

5.3.4 – Conclusion

I conclude this section by claiming that, at least in terms of his language and manner of presentation, Paul casts πορνεία in 1 Cor 6:18–19a as if it is sacrilege against the temple, in a way that resembles the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution. His sin vocabulary and his application of it mirrors a pattern of using sin-against-the-temple language to indicate sacrilege. Moreover, to link certain sex acts with sacrilege is attested not only in Jewish writings, but also in many writings of the broader Greco-Roman world. It remains to be seen, if Paul is presenting as πορνεία sacrilege, to what extent his argument follows the larger logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution. To answer this question, we must look further to the impact of this sacrilege. Sacrilege is generally accompanied by a specific set of consequences, so we may rightly ask whether such consequences are present here in 1 Cor 6, as I suggested they were in 1 Cor 3. I will begin to answer this question in the next section.

5.4 – Πορνεία as Sacrilege and the Loss of the Holy Spirit

I pointed out in earlier chapters that one distinction between the effects of moral pollution in the OT and major metaphysical pollution is tied to the concern or lack thereof for maintaining the presence of the gods. In the OT, moral pollution has potential to separate Israel from God. This

can happen either when someone sins and so must be "cut off" from God's presence,[64] or when the people as a whole and over time create sufficient pollution to infect the land and temple, and thus drive away God's presence and invite exile and judgement on themselves.[65] In texts following the patterns of major metaphysical pollution, sacrilege leads to judgement against the particular offender, but does not necessarily create some permanent pollution of the land or encourage large-scale loss of the god's presence. I also noted in previous chapters that many Pauline scholars believe Paul adopts a framework of OT moral pollution in 1 Cor 3 and 1 Cor 6 so that the potential loss of the Spirit in response to moral pollution drives his arguments against division and πορνεία.[66] I cited scholars such as Michael Newton, who says the Corinthians must "conduct themselves in such a manner as to enable God's presence to remain with them,"[67] as well as Cecilia Wassen,[68] Karl Donfried,[69] and Michael Suh.[70] Likewise, Robertson and Plummer explicitly mention the loss of God's Spirit as a result of pollution in their discussions of both 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19.[71] I suggested, in the previous chapter, that the effects of sacrilege in 1 Cor 3:16–17 more closely resemble effects seen in literature dealing with major

[64] E.g., Lev 22:3.

[65] See esp. Ezek 8—11, but the fear that Israel will drive God away and experience exile and destruction is found in a variety of other texts.

[66] To be sure, the notion that the Holy Spirit, specifically, will be driven away by sin is found only in Pss 51:11. The broader concern about God's presence, however, is attested widely, and many Pauline scholars believe Paul adapts this concern and ties it to the indwelling holy spirit.

[67] Newton 1985, 59.

[68] Wassen 2013, 78.

[69] Donfried 1976, 108–9.

[70] Suh 2020, 58–77.

[71] See Robertson and Plummer 1950, 66, for their discussion of 1 Cor 3. For their discussion of 1 Cor 6, see pg. 129 where they say, "Not content with emphasizing 'holy,' he [Paul] gives further emphasis to the preceding plea by pointing out that the indwelling Spirit is a gift direct from God Himself. Such a Spirit cannot dwell in a polluted sanctuary."

metaphysical pollution than the effects of moral pollution seen in the OT. Here, I will revisit the first point I made in the previous chapter concerning Paul's discussion of the loss of the Spirit, but I also must consider the context of 1 Cor 6 to discern if there is any evidence in this chapter that sexual immorality will drive away the Spirit.

I already noted in the previous chapter that in Paul's letters he emphasises the presence of the Spirit frequently, but in texts discussing that presence, he does not mention that believers could lose the Spirit. I pointed out that Paul speaks of receiving the Spirit,[72] the stative nature of the Spirit in the believer,[73] and God's distribution of the Spirit,[74] but without mentioning in those texts that the Spirit will return to God, that the Spirit's indwelling will cease, or that God will someday reclaim the Spirit from the believers. He also speaks of the spirit as a seal, which may well indicate some sort of permanence.[75] Here, I emphasise that Paul likewise says nothing about the loss of the Spirit in 1 Cor 6. He says only that the Corinthians have the Spirit, and we are left to sort what that means in terms of the effects of πορνεία by appeal to other data in the passage. This argument from silence is insufficient to establish a close connection to major metaphysical pollution over and against the logic of moral pollution in the OT, but it is a vital first step because it reveals that such a connection is possible given the perhaps surprising lack of evidence that Paul is concerned generally about the loss of the Spirit.

The more immediate context of 1 Cor 6:18–19a does little to confirm or deny whether the Spirit will be lost as the result of πορνεία. The only effect of πορνεία Paul mentions in this

[72] E.g., Rom 8:15; 1 Cor 2:12; Gal 3:2.

[73] E.g., Rom 8:9 and 8:11.

[74] E.g., Gal 4:6; 2 Cor 5:5; 1 Thess 4:8.

[75] Eph 4:30 and 2 Cor 1:22.

argument is that the πορνεύων sins against his own body, which is a temple. Sacrilege that leads to major metaphysical pollution is not always hazardous because it will drive away the gods. In many cases it is hazardous because it leads to some sort of physical danger for the perpetrator. There is, of course, need to consider the nature of sin against the body more carefully, and I will do so in the next major section. However, for now it is sufficient to note that the apparent consequences of πορνεία in this argument, focused as they are on some negative effect on the body, seem at least potentially compatible with a framework of major metaphysical pollution.

The wider context of 1 Cor 6, however, includes one interesting argument that could hint that the danger of πορνεία is related to offence against God rather than offence that will drive God away. In 1 Cor 6:15–17, Paul claims that the Corinthians' bodies are members of Christ (μέλη Χριστοῦ). He concludes from this (note the inferential οὖν in 1 Cor 6:15) that the Corinthians must not take Christ's members (their bodies) and unite them with a πόρνη. Why the union of Christ's members with a πόρνη is problematic is further explained in 1 Cor 6:16,[76] which reveals that the one-body union between a Corinthian and a πόρνη is incompatible with the one-spirit union between a Corinthian and ὁ κύριος. There is no indication that union with a πόρνη dissolves the union between Christ and the promiscuous Corinthian.[77] Instead, the danger of sex with a πόρνη seems to depend precisely on the fact that the Corinthian's body is still a member of Christ while fornicating, and therefore Christ's body is afflicted in some sense by it. It is

[76] The fact that the material in 1 Cor 6:16 provides an explanation for the material in 1 Cor 6:15 is evident from the use of οὐκ οἴδατε following μὴ γένοιτο. The presence or lack thereof of ἤ at the beginning of 1 Cor 6:16 need not concern us here. When paired with μὴ γένοιτο, the material following οὐκ οἴδατε is sufficiently marked as related to the material in 1 Cor 6:15 whether ἤ is present or not.

[77] Others take a similar position, such as Fee 1987, 260, who says that in 6:17 "Paul probably is referring to the work of the Spirit, whereby through the 'one Spirit' the believer's 'spirit' has been joined *indissolubly* with Christ" [emphasis mine]. Cf. Macaskill 2013, 157, who follows Fee.

"Christ's 'member' entering the body of the prostitute,"[78] to borrow Martin's words, and so Christ is also brought into contact with pollution.

This scenario, in which a certain behaviour seems to bring pollution against Christ, resembles the logic of pollution of the gods found in some texts that follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution. In several texts, one who commits serious, often sacrilegious crimes is said to have polluted the gods themselves.[79] For example, in Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus*, Oedipus desecrates the grove of the Eumenides, but it is neither the grove nor Oedipus who requires purification. Rather, he is urged to purify the gods![80] Here, as in 1 Cor 6, there is no hint that this pollution from which Oedipus must purify the gods actually harms them, nor that it will drive them away. Instead, the negative impact of such pollution damages only the guilty party. This is seen later in the story when, after urging Oedipus to purify the gods, the chorus warns that if he does not they will fear for him.[81] So, if Paul makes an argument that serious sin afflicts Christ or the Spirit, but without driving them away, he makes an argument that is attested in other literature that demonstrates the logic of major metaphysical pollution.

This argument in 1 Cor 6:15–17 is, as I noted above, a distinct section in Paul's argument from 1 Cor 6:18–19a, but it establishes the precedent that Paul can warn against a behaviour by

[78] Martin 1995, 176.

[79] See the discussion in Parker 1983, 145–46. Parker acknowledges that "This conception came to be criticized as crediting men with an unacceptable power over immortals" but he maintains that evidence of this concept remains nonetheless.

[80] Sophocles, *Oed. col.* 466. θοῦ νῦν καθαρμὸν τῶνδε δαιμόνων. Cf. Alciphron, *Ep.* 4.1, in which the writer expresses certainty that her actions will *not* pollute the gods (οὐ μιανοῦμεν γὰρ τοὺς θεούς), thus speaking to the possibility that *some* actions would pollute them. See also Plutarch, *Stoic. rep.* 1044 A – 1045 A, in which the topic concerns whether sex, certain foods, or death in the context of sacred space pollute the gods (μιαίνειν τὸ θεῖον).

[81] Sophocles, *Oed. Col.* 490–92.

saying it is an offence against the divine rather than saying it is something that could break the connection to the divine altogether.[82].

I have shown here that Paul tends to emphasise the Spirit's presence rather than warning that they will lose it. In 1 Cor 6, the only consequence of sacrilege he mentions is that the πορνεύων sins against his own body (which is also a temple). Emphasising the effects of sacrilege on one's own body is similar to many texts that follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution. He also makes an argument in 1 Cor 6:15–17 that depends for its force on the continued union with Christ in spite of sin, which parallels some discussions of sacrilege and pollution. This demonstrates the plausibility of reading 1 Cor 6:18–19a as an argument that depends on the Spirit's continued presence in spite of sin. These data points open up more fully the possibility that 1 Cor 6:18–19a draws on the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution outlined in chapter 2, because the effects of πορνεία are compatible with that system. It remains to be seen, however, whether the resolution of Paul's argument coheres with the danger of judgement as a result of pollution.

5.5 – The Danger of Πορνεία

Unlike 1 Cor 3:16–17, there is no clearly defined judgement described in 1 Cor 6:18–19a. Does this mean the resolution of temple pollution in 1 Cor 6:19 deviates significantly from the pattern of major metaphysical pollution? Three area of analysis emerge for consideration. First, we must ask if Paul's language about sinning against the body-temple suggests some kind of danger. Second, if it does indicate danger, what kind of danger is it? Is Paul here describing a communal

[82] On this point I am close to the now dated scholarship of Swete 1921, 181, who also believes the danger of πορνεία in the body that is a temple is problematic because of the close relationship of body and Spirit, rather than because the Spirit will leave the body. He says, "The general lesson is clear: You are God's consecrated shrine . . . beware lest your relation to the Holy Spirit be your ruin."

or individual danger, and how would this cohere with or deviate from the logic of major metaphysical pollution? Third, when Paul talks about the use of the body and sin against the body, is he talking about physical bodies? Or is he talking in some sort of spiritualised or metaphorical terms? If we find that Paul's argument indicates a dangerous and physical consequence for guilty temple desecrators (people who commit πορνεία) then there will be a significant degree of coherence between his argument and the logic of sacrilege and pollution.

5.5.1 – The Danger of Sin Against the Self

Much of the discussion concerning 1 Cor 6:18 revolves around questions of how and why πορνεία, as opposed to some other sin, is a sin against the body. This leads to a variety of positions concerning both the nature of the sex act as well as the effect it has on the body and/or whole person who engages in it.[83] While these questions are worthwhile, in order to complete our comparison with the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution, we must ask whether saying that πορνεία is a sin against the body indicates some serious danger that might visit the πορνεύων. Answering this question will require a comparison of sin-against-the-body language with LXX texts that use similar language in the context of sexual immorality and an analysis of the relationship between sexual promiscuity and danger in Jewish wisdom literature.

I start by noting that the language of sinning against oneself (εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἁμαρτάνει) can indicate a threat to one's life. Prov 20:2 reads: οὐ διαφέρει ἀπειλὴ βασιλέως θυμοῦ λέοντος, ὁ δὲ παροξύνων αὐτὸν ἁμαρτάνει εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν. The one who disturbs the king sins against

[83] For just a few examples of the many ways scholars have attempted to solve the puzzle of 1 Cor 6:18, consider the following. Bultmann 1952, 1:195, sees the sex act as one that affects "that which is most intimately connected with man." Käsemann 1964, 133, sees πορνεία as something that distorts human relationships. Rosner 1994, 145, says "sexual immorality is a sin against the body because its legacy is permanent." Fisk 1996, 541, emphasises the sin's "*immediate and essential nature* as somatic union [emphasis original]." Thiselton 2000, 474, and Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 264, both view the sex act as giving oneself over to the mastery of someone else.

his life because of the potential for the king to be enraged and threatening like a lion. This context suggests that, in this case, sinning against one's life means putting one's life into an endangered position. The translation of this text in several translations such as the NRSV ("forfeits life itself"), CEB ("may lose their life"), ESV ("forfeits his life"), and NIV ("forfeit their lives"), follows precisely this interpretation. The fact that sinning against oneself carries the threat of physical danger in this passage establishes that Paul could also adopt the language of sinning against oneself to warn of danger to one's life.

Is it plausible, though, that Paul would use sin-against-the-body language in a warning about the danger of πορνεία in particular? Sexual promiscuity is commonly linked to one's own destruction in Jewish wisdom literature. For example, Prov 6:32 says that anyone who commits adultery has no sense, and that he "destroys himself" (ἀπώλειαν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ περιποιεῖται). Prov 7:22–23 compares the one seduced by a promiscuous woman to an ox on the way to the slaughter, a stag bounding into a trap that ends in its death, or a bird rushing into a snare that will ultimately cost him his life (ψυχή). Numerous other texts could likewise be cited here.[84] In light of the close association between sexual immorality and destruction in Jewish literature, it seems likely that Paul would present πορνεία, specifically, as a life-endangering sin against the self.

The fact that there are signs of resonance between Paul's use of sin-against-the-body language and Jewish wisdom literature does not mean, however, that Paul is doing something exclusively Jewish here, such that his argument must depend solely on the logic of temple pollution in OT texts rather than on other systems of pollution. In fact, using sin-against-the-body language in connection to unacceptable sex acts is attested also in Greek literature outside

[84] Fisk 1996, 545–46, provides several of these passages, including Prov 2:16–19, 5:3–23, 6:23–35, 7:6–27, Sir 9:1–9, 23:16–27, 25:2, 26:22, 41:17–22, 47:19.

of the Bible. In Aeschines, *Against Timarchus*, a law is cited restricting those who have practiced prostitution from holding certain offices. Those who have prostituted themselves are referred to as people who sin against their own bodies (εἰς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα ἐξαμαρτανόντων).[85] Keener is therefore correct to claim, "The argument [in 1 Cor 6:18] would be intelligible even to Greeks for sexual practices they considered shameful."[86]

There are important similarities, then, between Paul's claim that πορνεία is a sin against the body in 1 Cor 6:18 and the frequent depiction of sexual promiscuity as a life-threatening force in Jewish wisdom literature. I conclude, based on these data, that Paul presents πορνεία as an act that leads to danger for the perpetrator. This conclusion is vital for this thesis because of the extent to which it aligns with discussions of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution. It is expected that an act of sacrilege will lead to danger for the sacrilegious person, and this seems to be the case here in 1 Cor 6:18. So, at least this far, 1 Cor 6:18–19a fits with the cause, effect, and resolution of pollution. This leaves two further questions. Is the danger of πορνεία individual or corporate, and does it afflict the physical body?

5.5.2 – Sin Against One's Own Body

In the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution, it is common for pollution to resolve only through negative, physical judgement against the perpetrator of the crime. Does Paul's argument in 1 Cor 6:18–19a also present an individualised danger against the sexually immoral

[85] Aeschines, *Tim.* 22. Cf. *Tim.* 159, in which the sexually deviant are said to have sinned against themselves (τοὺς εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἐξαμαρτάνοντας). See also the seriousness with which prostitution is approached in passages such as *Tim.* 185 and 188.

[86] Keener 2005, 58.

person? Some Pauline scholars push against an individualistic reading of τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα, stating instead that the body under discussion is the church body as a whole. Ruth Kempthorne says,

> The word ἴδιος is often used without the specific sense of 'private,' 'personal,' 'individual'; often it is no more than a possessive adjective. The point here then is that the σῶμα is '*his*,' and there is probably a play on the word: 'Outside the Body, you say? But it is *his* Body—and his *body.* He [the πορνεύων] is committing a sin both against the Body of which he is a member, and against his own self by removing himself from the Body.'[87]

Kempthorne is followed by Newton, who claims, "Paul is saying in verse 18c that the immoral man is sinning both against his own body and the body of the Church of which he is a member."[88] Both scholars rely on the work of Charles Moule.[89]

The problem with Kempthorne's and Newton's readings is that neither scholar clearly establishes why, if ἴδιος can *sometimes* be merely a possessive adjective, we should take it as such in 1 Cor 6:18.[90] Kempthorne's first argument is that "the Corinthians were later able to understand the phrase in the corporate sense at 1 Clem. 46:7."[91] She does not acknowledge, however, that the governing verb in this passage is plural, not singular.[92] Since 1 Cor 6:18 uses

---

[87] Kempthorne 1968, 572.

[88] Newton 1985, 57.

[89] Moule 1953, 121. He says that ἴδιος is "sometimes practically no more than a possessive adjective," citing John 1:41 and Matt 22:5. Moule does not explain, however, why we should read ἴδιος in these two texts as a mere possessive adjective. The first of these verses says that Andrew sought out his own (ἴδιος) brother, Simon, and shared with him the news of the Messiah. It is not clear whether the use of ἴδιος is merely a possessive adjective or whether emphasis is placed on seeking one's own brother as opposed to some other person. In the second text, a man who is invited to a wedding banquet refuses, going instead εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν. It is at least possible that here ἴδιος emphasises the return to his own farm as opposed to the wedding banquet offered by the king.

[90] I am in agreement with Fisk 1996, 548, n. 27, who states, "Kempthorne's view ('Incest'), that Paul intends a play on words in 6.18c, and means that the sin is against the man's body and *also* Christ's body, the church, musters virtually no contextual support, and depends upon an impossible reading of ἴδιος (his own)."

[91] Kempthorne 1968, 572.

[92] The text reads: στασιάζομεν πρὸς τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἴδιον (1 Clem. 46:7).

only singular verbs, it is not clear that ἴδιος should mean a corporate, rather than an individual, body. Her second argument is to point out that taking ἴδιος as a simple possessive adjective removes any ambiguity concerning whether the σῶμα refers to a physical body or the whole person, and adds that taking ἴδιος in this way allows the temple in 1 Cor 6:19 to function exactly as the temple in 1 Cor 3:16–17 (that is, corporately).[93] Similarly, Newton, after citing Moule (but without comment on Moule's argument), says, "If we accept this understanding of the use of ἴδιος in verse 18 then it is possible to see the following Temple verse as no different from 1 Corinthians 3:16 or 2 Corinthians 6:16."[94] These observations are not actually arguments as to why ἴδιος in 1 Cor 6:18 should be read as a simple possessive adjective, but rather statements about how our understanding of the temple image in 1 Cor 6:19 would change if one *were* to read ἴδιος in that way. Moreover, it is not necessarily problematic that in 1 Cor 3 Paul uses temple imagery in a corporate sense, while in 1 Cor 6 he uses it in an individualistic sense, because there are examples of ancient writers (and Jews at that!) who use temple imagery in both ways.[95] These statements from Kempthorne and Newton do not, therefore, provide sufficient evidence that ἴδιος has a corporate sense in 1 Cor 6:18.

[93] Kempthorne 1968, 572–73.

[94] Newton 1985, 57.

[95] Philo uses metaphorical temple/house of God imagery with reference to individuals in *Cherubim* 98; *Unchangeable* 9; 134; *Sobr.* 62; *Dreams* 1.149, 2.250–51; *Rewards* 123; *Creation* 137. Several texts from Qumran apply metaphorical temple imagery in a corporate sense. See, e.g., 1QS VIII, 4–10; 4Q174 I, 1–8.

The fact that we have examples of Jews applying metaphorical temple imagery both to individuals and to entire communities establishes that it is within the realm of possibility for Paul to apply temple imagery in either way. There need be no contradiction here between 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 simply because they contain unique applications of temple imagery. A fuller and excellent comparison of Paul's temple language with Qumran's is provided by Regev 2019, 62–66.

Without any clear contextual reason for taking ἴδιος as simply a possessive adjective, it is better to read it as performing its usual task: highlighting something that is "one's own" as opposed to someone else's.[96] Numerous biblical texts support this usual use of the word. Acts 4:32 establishes a contrast between what is ἴδιος (one's own private property) and what is common or communal (κοινός). In Matt 25:15, each slave receives a distinct number of talents in accordance with his own ability (κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν) as opposed to someone else's ability. Both passages emphasise what is distinctively one's own *in contrast* to what others have.[97] Even more importantly for this discussion, in 1 Corinthians we see similar usage. In 1 Cor 7:4, Paul asserts that those who are married do not have authority over their own, as opposed to their spouses', bodies (τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος) but rather that both partners in the marriage should give the other what he or she is owed. In light of the frequent attestation of ἴδιος being used to indicate what is particular, private, or distinctive, it is best to read the word in the same way in 1 Cor 6:18, namely, as a statement that the πορνεύων sins particularly against his own body, as opposed to anyone else's.

Taking ἴδιος individualistically also does not contradict corporate elements that appear elsewhere in 1 Corinthians. The corporate dimension is often stressed by Pauline scholars who deal with the issue of πορνεία. Liu, for example, suggests that the sin of πορνεία in 1 Cor 6:18 has a "negative effect on the individual and the community," and he further claims that, "the misuse of the individual body has a direct impact on the entire community."[98] Hogeterp rightly notes,

[96] The associations between this word and privacy, particularity, and distinctiveness are abundantly testified in BDAG and LSJ, s.v., ἴδιος.

[97] Cf. also Luke 6:41; 1 Thess 2:14.

[98] Liu 2013, 163.

"Paul addresses the individual responsibility for sins against one's own body," and adds, "but the persistence of individual sins in the midst of the congregation may also endanger the communal holiness, as 1 Cor 5:1–13 suggests."[99] The corporate effect of πορνεία is certainly important to Paul, and not something I wish to deny. I aim to say simply that the particular argument Paul makes in 1 Cor 6:18–19a is *not* an argument about the communal effect of πορνεία. These arguments are made elsewhere in 1 Corinthians.[100] The language of 1 Cor 6:18 highlights the effects of πορνεία as they specifically afflict the πορνεύων who engages in it.

I have argued here that τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα should be taken individualistically. Scholars who push against this reading do not adequately explain why ἴδιος should be seen as a possessive adjective in 1 Cor 6:18. The usual use of ἴδιος is to highlight what relates particularly or exclusively to one person as opposed to others. If ἴδιος in 1 Cor 6:18 is referring to "one's own" body as the victim of the sacrilege of πορνεία, then it bears one important similarity to sacrilege as conceptualised by writers following the logic of major metaphysical pollution: the ultimate consequences of sacrilege resolve through the particular affliction of the perpetrator. Establishing this connection does much to illustrate the possible resonance between 1 Cor 6:18–19a and concepts of sacrilege and pollution, but one other question remains. The consequences of sacrilege are usually some sort of physical judgement. Should we understand the reference to one's own body in 1 Cor 6:18 as a physical body? In the next section, I will argue that the body

[99] Hogeterp 2006, 341. Cerfaux 1959, 146 n. 8, is similarly concerned to emphasise the corporate nature of Paul's temple imagery. He says of 1 Cor 6:19: "Paul is using expressions that occur in 1 Cor. 3:16. Individual applications are secondary to the chief idea of holiness of the whole Christian community."

[100] These arguments appear most clearly in 1 Cor 5. There, the leaven of sexual immorality ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. The proposed response is for the community, as a group, to drive out the immoral person so that the community, as a group, may be a new loaf and celebrate the festival rightly.

against which the πορνεύων sins is physical, and I will point out how this coheres with major metaphysical pollution.

5.5.3 – The Physical Body

The resolution of major metaphysical pollution is frequently accomplished by means of a physical judgement against the guilty. If we accept that 1 Cor 6:18–19a describes a danger to the individual body of the πορνεύων, does that mean the danger is physical, or spiritual? The topic of Pauline anthropology and the words he uses to refer to aspects of the human person is, of course, complex and riddled with nuance. In the discussions of σῶμα alone we find a variety of approaches to understanding Paul's use of this vocabulary.[101] Johannes Weiss suggested a century ago that σῶμα in Paul could refer not just to one's physical body, but rather to one's entire personality or whole self.[102] Other scholars adopt a similar approach, interpreting σῶμα as something more like "personality" than physical body alone.[103] Some scholars even go so far as to deny that the σῶμα is the flesh-and-blood body.[104] In relation to the more specific context of 1 Cor 6:12–20, however, many scholars accept that, whatever else σῶμα may mean, it must also include the physical body.[105]

---

[101] Eastman 2017, chap. 3, provides analysis of body language in Paul with reference to some of the more influential approaches, particularly those of Bultmann and Käsemann.

[102] Weiss 1925, 161–63.

[103] "Personality" is precisely the word adopted by Robinson 1952, 31. Other scholars who see σῶμα as the whole personality include Bultmann 1952, 1:192–203, and Ellis 1990.

[104] So Dodd 1932, 90, who claims "the body is the individual self as an organism" and "not the structure of flesh and blood."

[105] Among the scholars in my history of interpretation this position is common. Richardson 2018, 178, claims 1 Cor 6:12–20 "is tied together by a 'focus on the corporeal' (with the multiple descriptors σῶμα, κοιλία, σάρξ), whether that is *purely* related to the physical body or to the person as a whole 'viewed particularly as a physical being.'" Likewise, McKelvey 1969, 102, takes the σῶμα in 1 Cor 6:19–20 to mean "the body (σῶμα) of the individual Christian believer" is the temple of God. Hogeterp 2006, 340, sees in 1 Cor 6 references to "the

In this section, I will simply note what many other scholars have already suggested and affirm that the σῶμα in 1 Cor 6:18 refers to the physical body. I will look first at σῶμα in the broader context of 1 Cor 6:12–17 and point out that its use in those verses seems to demand that it refer to the physical body. I will then briefly consider the content of 1 Cor 6:18 and note that it seems most fitting to take σῶμα there as a physical body as well.

In 1 Cor 6:13–14, the argument about the proper use of the σῶμα indicates that the σῶμα must include the physical body. In 1 Cor 6:13 Paul affirms that the σῶμα is not for πορνεία but for the Lord. The relationship between σῶμα and πορνεία, something in which one participates only by means of a physical, flesh-and-blood body, hints that σῶμα must here include the physical body. Indeed, even Rudolf Bultmann concurs on this point, arguing that σῶμα refers to the physical body at least "insofar as it is the seat of sex-life."[106] Paul then argues that the resurrection of the Lord, and by implication, the Corinthians, strengthens his point. It is this resurrection, which is bodily,[107] that necessarily leads to the restriction of certain activities in the current body, namely, immoral sex. As N.T. Wright notes: "The point here is *continuity*. Those who already stand on resurrection ground, and must learn to live in this new world, need to be

individual bodies" of the Corinthians. Gupta 2010, 73, claims, "focusing on the matter of sexual immorality (πορνεία), Paul argues that the body as God created it was not intended for such behavior."

Other scholars who see σῶμα in 1 Cor 6:12–20 as related in some sense to the physical body include: Coppens 1973; Gundry 1976; Murphy-O'Connor 1978; Byrne 1983; Fisk 1996; N.T. Wright 2013a; 2013b; Naselli 2017.

[106] Bultmann 2007, 194–95.

[107] See 1 Cor 15, esp. 15:44: Σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν. Εἰ ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν. The resurrected body is a different kind of body, but a body nonetheless.

reminded that what they do with their bodies in the present matters, because the spirit who dwells within them will cause them to be raised as the Messiah was raised."[108]

The σῶμα also appears to be physical in 1 Cor 6:15–17. It is possible to read τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν in 1 Cor 6:15 as a reference to the whole selves or personalities of the Corinthians, which are joined to Christ, but the second half of the verse renders this approach problematic. The conclusion Paul draws from the first clause is that these members of Christ should not unite (sexually) with a πόρνη, something that is possible only with a physical body. As Gundry notes, this meaning continues into 1 Cor 6:16 in the discussion of becoming ἓν σῶμά with a πόρνη.[109] The use of Gen 2:24, a passage discussing the union of man and woman as one flesh in marriage (εἰς σάρκα μίαν), to support the argument clarifies that ἓν σῶμά must refer to the joining of two bodies in sexual union, that is, physically.[110]

Given the ways σῶμα is used elsewhere in 1 Cor 6:12–20, and given the way it is used in 1 Cor 6:18, it most likely carries the meaning of physicality in 1 Cor 6:18 as well. I argued that the point made in 1 Cor 6:18–19a is not the same point as the one made in 1 Cor 6:15–17, but in 1 Cor 6:18, as in 1 Cor 6:12–17, the topic under discussion remains πορνεία. This is something done through the physical body. As before, the argument of 1 Cor 6:18–19a is still part of an effort to dissuade the Corinthians from committing πορνεία (by means of their bodies) by warning that such an action constitutes a sin against that very body. So, despite the differences

[108] N.T. Wright 2013b, 1112.

[109] Gundry 1976, 78.

[110] In agreement with Fisk 1996, 548.

between the argument in 1 Cor 6:18–19a and the arguments made before it, here as before σῶμα must include the physical body.

I have not attempted to address the larger issues of σῶμα and anthropology in Paul, but my argument does not depend on the particular nuances of this debate. Instead, for my purpose, it is sufficient simply to note what Pauline scholarship often recognises, namely, that the σῶμα signifies a corporeal, physical aspect of human life in 1 Cor 6:18. This is of vital importance for my thesis. If sinning against one's own body in 1 Cor 6:18 indicates some sort of danger to the πορνεύων, as I have argued it does; if this danger is restricted particularly to the body that belongs to the πορνεύων, as I have argued it is; and if the σῶμα in 1 Cor 6:18 is the physical body, as it usually understood; then Paul's argument bears uncanny resemblance to the discussions of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution highlighted in chapter 2.

5.6 – Conclusion: Paul's Argument in its Ancient Context

5.6.1 – Paul, Sacrilege, and Major Metaphysical Pollution

I will now summarise the ways in which Paul's use of temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19 follows a pattern common to discussions of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution. I began by considering if Paul's description of πορνεία could indicate sacrilege (a cause of major metaphysical pollution) at all. I showed that Paul uses language in 1 Cor 6:18–19a that can be indicative of sacrilege and that describing sex as a sacrilegious act is compatible with texts that follow the logic of major metaphysical pollution. The particular terms used to indicate such pollution (ἅγος and ἐναγής) are absent in 1 Corinthians, but these words are often lacking in other literature too, so this alone does not determine whether Paul's argument mirrors patterns in other texts. The effect of sacrilege in 1 Cor 6:18–19a seems not to include the loss of the Spirit's

presence (in contrast to the concern for the loss of God's presence due to moral pollution in the OT), and it is at least possible, in light of the precedent set by 1 Cor 6:15–17, that Paul is concerned about offence *against* the Spirit rather than the loss of the Spirit. How is the sin of πορνεία resolved? Πορνεία constitutes a potentially life endangering sin against one's own, particular, physical body, which resonates with the frequent resolution of pollution by focused, physical judgement. So, all aspects of major metaphysical pollution are present except for the terms, but they are not necessary anyway. I conclude, based on these data, that Paul's argument does draw on the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution outlined in chapter 2.

It is worth noting that the argument here proceeds in a reverse order from the argument in 1 Cor 3:16–17. In 1 Cor 3:16–17, the crime (destroying God's temple) is provided in terms of sacrilege first, and then judgement is tied to it. Here, the dangerous effects of πορνεία are described first (in 1 Cor 6:18), and only after this does Paul explain why πορνεία leads to those particular consequences, namely, because πορνεία is in fact an act of sacrilege against the temple (1 Cor 6:19). The reversed order of these elements is not problematic, as it is well attested in other texts.[111] My analysis of 1 Cor 6:19 in light of discussions of major metaphysical pollution is provided below.

[111] For example, in the story of Croesus that I cited earlier, Croesus experiences the consequences of polluting bloodshed long before he ever realises why he is experiencing them. See Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 1.91.

Table 9 – 1 Cor 6:18–19a and Major Metaphysical Pollution			
Cause	**Terms**	**Effect**	**Resolution**
Πορνεία in the body that is a temple, presented in a way that can indicate sacrilege.	The words ἅγος and ἐναγής are absent, but sex is a common source of pollution when it occurs in temples.	Secondary effects are not described, but there is no indication in these verses that πορνεία drives away the Holy Spirit and it is in fact possible that Paul's argument assumes the Spirit will remain in spite of πορνεία.	The πορνεύων sins against his own body and this language can indicate life-threatening danger.

5.6.2 – Paul, Jews, and Major Metaphysical Pollution

As in the previous chapter, it is useful to note how Paul's argument compares with his contemporary Jewish writers. I contend that Paul's argument in 1 Cor 6:18–19a employs major metaphysical pollution in ways that are consistent with the ways it is employed by Josephus and Philo. As in the case of 1 Cor 3:16–17, Paul uses this pollution to highlight judgement, to reinterpret an undesirable behaviour (πορνεία) as sacrilege, and to warn against this behaviour. In addition, the use of major metaphysical pollution to build a deterrent against certain sex acts is found in Philo as well. I noted above that Philo appeals to precisely these concepts when pushing against violations of sex and gender norms.[112] So, Paul's argument in 1 Cor 6:18a–19 not only parallels Philo in the general sense of a shared polllution framework, but also in the more specific sense of an appeal to major metaphysical pollution to push against sexual deviancy.

As I stated before, this comparison between Paul and other Jewish writers establishes that my reading of Paul as one who employs major metaphysical pollution is historically plausible,

[112] See Philo, *Spec. Laws* 3.7.42.

because such a use of this system is found in other Jewish writers of the era. In addition, this comparison clarifies why Paul would use these concepts. By invoking major metaphysical pollution, first-century Jews gain access to a flexible system that allows for the interpretation of novel acts as dangerous, sacrilegious crimes that lead to judgement. This provides them with material to construct forceful and potentially compelling arguments..

5.6.3 – The Temple as a Warning

The final question is to ask how the analysis of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution shifts the reading of the temple in 1 Cor 6:19. Many scholars see the application of the temple in positive terms. That is, they believe the appeal to the temple elevates the value of the body and teaches the Corinthians to live a life characterised by holiness over and against a pagan devaluation of the body and willingness to participate in πορνεία. Other times they emphasise the need to maintain God's presence in the temple. These readings owe much to an emphasis on Paul as a Jew and an assumption that Jewish concepts of temples, purity, and the body are diametrically opposed to Greco-Roman ones. This often leads to reading Paul alongside of the OT instead of reading Paul as a first-century reader of the OT.

To be sure, Paul's argument does draw on what we might call "Jewish" views of sex and the body, and Paul does push against certain behaviours that were common in the wider Greco-Roman world, but I have shown that Jews and Gentiles alike appealed to major metaphysical pollution. Acknowledging this gives us a different framework within which to read Paul's temple imagery and suggests that a reading focused on the danger of sacrilege against a temple is more plausible than has often been supposed. What is more, the positive directive to glorify god in the body is, as I have suggested, a different point from the one made in 6:18–19a. A close reading of 6:18–19a in conversation with the wider world of ancient literature dealing with sacrilege

suggests that Paul's particular argument in these verses applies the image of the temple in order to warn of the disastrous consequences of πορνεία for the Corinthians' bodies.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, I will offer my conclusions for this study. I will initially summarise the argument I have made. I will then offer some conclusions concerning Paul and his use of temple imagery. I will close with a nod towards further areas of study.

6.1 – Summary

I have asked if Paul's use of temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 follows a pattern of thinking common to ancient literature discussing sacrilege. I began in chapter 1 with a discussion of the motivation for this thesis. I explained that 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:19 were ripe for comparison with discussions of sacrilege because in both texts a holy temple is under threat. I surveyed major monographs and articles that touch on the topics of temple and cultic imagery in Paul, and found none that offered a detailed discussion of concepts of sacrilege. I suggested that this owed in part to a tendency to dichotomise Jewish and Greco-Roman material such that non-Jewish texts are treated minimally in scholarship on Paul's temple imagery.

In chapter 2, I noted a connection between sacrilege and a particular system, labelled "major metaphysical pollution," that appears frequently in ancient literature. I explained my choice of sources and argued that the common pattern found in these sources speaks to the comprehensibility of the system for people in the ancient Greco-Roman world. I then worked through the major features of this pollution system, noting throughout how it compared with the patterns of moral and ritual pollution in the OT and pointing out ways that we could determine if Paul follows the logic of this pollution system. This laid the foundation for comparison of Paul with major metaphysical pollution, but left unanswered whether any Jews used this pollution

system as well. This was vital to consider because so many scholars have assumed that concepts of temples deemed "Greco-Roman" or "pagan" are irrelevant for understanding a first-century Jew like Paul.

Chapter 3 picked up this topic of major metaphysical pollution in Jewish writers, specifically Josephus and Philo. I pressed here against scholars who suppose such a disjunction between Greco-Roman and Jewish material that they cannot imagine Paul using concepts of temples found extensively in non-Jewish sources. I worked through instances in Josephus and Philo that demonstrate the pattern of thinking common in discussions of major metaphysical pollution. I also highlighted two ways they use this system of pollution. The first way is to clarify the cause and nature of instances of judgement. The second way is to cast some behaviour as the source of pollution and push against it. This established that Paul, as a Jew, could use major metaphysical pollution, and it gave us material with which to compare Paul's potential use of major metaphysical pollution.

In chapter 4, I presented my exegesis of 1 Corinthians 3. I suggested that 1 Cor 3:16–17 does not continue the topic of 1 Cor 3:5–15 but warns the *Corinthians* not to destroy the temple through division. Building on this understanding of who destroys the temple and how, I was able to compare 1 Cor 3:16–17 with the cause, effect, and resolution of major metaphysical pollution. I argued that Paul presents destroying the temple through division in terms that could indicate an act of sacrilege, a cause of major metaphysical pollution. In regards to the effect of this sacrilege, I suggested that temple destruction does not drive away the Spirit, but instead brings judgement on the perpetrator. I argued this judgement was both physical and inevitable. I concluded, therefore, that Paul's temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16–17 coheres with the logic of sacrilege and

major metaphysical pollution. What is more, his use of this pollution system parallels the use of this system by Josephus and Philo.

In chapter 5, I exegeted 1 Corinthians 6. I argued that we should take 1 Cor 6:18–19a as one point that is distinct from 1 Cor 6:15–17 and 1 Cor 6:19b–20. I then looked again at the cause, effect, and resolution of major metaphysical polllution. I argued that 1 Cor 6:18–19a employs sin language in a way that resonates with language used to indicate sacrilege, thus providing a sufficient cause for the creation of pollution. I urged that the effects of this sacrilege do not include the loss of the Spirit. I contended that the consequence of this sacrilege mirror discussions of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution in that they include afflictions of the specific, physical body of the πορνεύων. I concluded that here, as in 1 Cor 3:16–17, Paul's temple imagery aligns with discussions of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution and also parallels the use of major metaphysical pollution in Josephus and Philo.

6.2 – Conclusions

There are two significant conclusions to draw from this study; one concerning Paul and one concerning the letter of 1 Corinthians. Dealing first with Paul, if my reading is compelling, then it seems that Paul does in fact incorporate elements of the logic of sacrilege and major metaphysical pollution in 1 Corinthians. What is more, he does so even when using the image of the temple, a point concerning Paul's use of "Greco-Roman" material that much previous scholarship resists. This does not mean, and this is vital to note, that I am driving a wedge between Paul and the Jewish world. Indeed, what I have demonstrated is that if Paul appeals to these concepts of temples, sacrilege, pollution, and judgement, then he is only doing something that other Jews in the first century also did. This seems to be the way many Jews in the first century thought, the lens through which they read the OT, and the framework within which they

interpreted certain kinds of events. There need be no resistance to the idea of Paul, as a Jew, adopting patterns of thinking common in the wider Greco-Roman world, as if this could return us to a kind of pre-Sanders Paul. Instead, we should recognise that Paul, as a first-century Jew in the Hellenised world, could and did employ elements of that world in his writing.

Dealing with 1 Corinthians, my reading of Paul's temple imagery shifts how I see the rhetorical purpose of such imagery from the position of most other scholars. Many scholars see the application of temple imagery in a positive light. That is, they highlight how the temple image urges the Corinthians towards unity, invites them to live a holy life, casts them as an eschatological community that fulfills Israel's hopes, and validates life in the body. I have argued that Paul employs temple imagery here, in this particular letter, in a more restricted sense. It is used to warn the Corinthians that some of their behaviours are dangerous to their well-being in the same way that sacrilege against a physical temple is dangerous.

6.3 – Areas for Further Study

Two areas for further study immediately present themselves. The most obvious is the study of temple imagery in Ephesians and 2 Corinthians in connection with other aspects of temples and their use in the ancient world. I explained in my first chapter why I chose not to consider these texts for this project, and this is because they do not show the same resonance with discussions of sacrilege that 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 1 Cor 6:18–19 do. However, the potential for our reading of Eph and 2 Cor to be enriched by appeal to other contextual material, much of which might have been bracketed out as "Greco-Roman" and therefore irrelevant, remains. This is particularly true for Ephesians, where there is language of building and construction that bears great similarity to 1 Cor 3. A number of scholars have drawn on data related to construction in the broader Greco-Roman world to understand 1 Cor 3, and it may well be that similar data is useful for

understanding the distinct arguments of Eph 2 as well, despite the very different ways in which these two texts employ temple imagery. Then again, it is also possible that these texts use temple imagery in ways that are self-consciously distinct from what their author views as "Gentile" concepts of temples, and this too would be valuable to uncover, because it would reveal ways in which the early Christ followers attempted to distinguish themselves from their surrounding culture. In either case, there is good reason to study these texts closely and in conversation with the broader Greco-Roman world, without dismissing material from that world from the outset.

A second area of study is related to the comparison of concepts of sacrilege and pollution with other biblical passages that do not contain any reference to a temple. Consider a text like Rom 2:22, in which Paul asks if those who abhor idols also commit sacrilege (ἱεροσυλέω). This text uses a word that is found only once in the NT, but which occurs with some frequency elsewhere in Greek literature. The fact that this word indicates temple robbery, a common cause of sacrilege, is also noteworthy. Does the logic of major metaphysical pollution lie behind this text and does this reveal anything about the kind of argument Paul is making? Consider also, 1 Cor 5. Here, incest (which can lead to ἅγος) is said to pollute the community. What is more, the response to this pollution is the expulsion of the guilty for judgement, for the protection of the community. Does this text also follow a pattern of thinking built on the system of major metaphysical pollution, and, if so, does this shift our understanding of the nature and purpose of judgement against the incestuous man? A close comparison between this text and major metaphysical pollution could yield fruitful results. These passages and many others invite new analysis, which could further clarify how Paul, as a first-century Jew and apostle to the Gentiles, engaged the complex cultural map of the first-century, Greco-Roman world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Aelian. 1959. *On Animals, Books 6–11*. Translated by A. F. Scholfield. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1997. *Historical Miscellany*. Translated by N. G. Wilson. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Aeschines. 1919. *Speeches*. Translated by C. D. Adams. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Aeschylus. 2009. *Persians. Seven against Thebes. Suppliants. Prometheus Bound*. Translated by Alan H. Sommerstein. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 2009. *Oresteia: Agamemnon. Libation-Bearers. Eumenides.* Edited and translated by Alan H. Sommerstein. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Andocides. 1941. *Minor Attic Orators, Volume I: Antiphon. Andocides.* Translated by K. J. Maidment. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Appian. 1913. *Roman History: The Civil Wars, Books 3.27–5*. Translated by Horace White. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Appian. 2019. *Roman History, Volume II.* Edited and translated by Brian McGing. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 2019. *Roman History, Volume III.* Edited and translated by Brian McGing. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.Apuleius. 1989–1996. *Metamorphoses (The Golden Ass).* Edited and translated by J. Arthur Hanson. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Aristophanes. 2002. *Frogs. Assemblywomen. Wealth*. Edited and translated by Jeffrey Henderson. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Aristotle. 1926. *Nicomachean Ethics.* Translated by H. Rackham. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1935. *Metaphysics, Volume II: Books 10-14. Oeconomica. Magna Moralia.* Translated by Hugh Tredennick, G. Cyril Armstrong. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Artemidorus. 2012. *Artemidorus' Oneirocritica: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Translated by Daniel E. Harris-McCoy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cicero. 1933. *On the Nature of the Gods. Academics*. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

[Cicero]. 1954. *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* Translated by Harry Caplan. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Demosthenes. 1926–49. *Orations*. Translated by J. H. Vince et al. 7 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dio Cassius. 1917. *Roman History, Volume VI: Books 51-55.* Translated by Earnest Cary, Herbert B. Foster. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Diodorus Siculus. 1933–67. *Library of History*. Translated by C. H. Oldfather et al. 12 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. 1937–1950. *Roman Antiquities*. Translated by Earnest Cary. 7 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Epictetus. 1925. *Discourses: Books 1–2*. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1928. *Discourses: Books 3–4. Fragments. The Encheiridion*. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Euripides. 1994. *Cyclops. Alcestis. Medes*. Edited and translated by David Kovacs. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1995. *Children of Heracles. Hippolytus. Andromache. Hecuba*. Edited and translated by David Kovacs. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1998. *Suppliant Women. Electra. Heracles.* Edited and translated by David Kovacs. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 2002. *Helen. Phoenician Women. Orestes*. Edited and translated by David Kovacs. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Herodotus. 1920–1925. *The Persian Wars*. Translated by A. D. Godley. 4 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hesiod. 2007. *Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia*. Edited and translated by Glenn W. Most. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hippocrates. 1923. *Prognostic. Regimen in Acute Diseases. The Sacred Disease. The Art. Breaths. Law. Decorum. Physician (Ch. 1). Dentition*. Translated by W. H. S. Jones. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Horace. 2004. *Odes and Epodes.* Edited and translated by Niall Rudd. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Isocrates. 1928. *To Demonicus. To Nicocles. Nicocles or the Cyprians. Panegyricus. To Philip. Archidamus*. Translated by George Norlin. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Josephus. 1926. *The Life*. *Against Apion*. Translated by Henry St. J. Thackeray. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1927–28. *The Jewish War*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. 3 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–1928.

———. 1930–1965. *Jewish Antiquities*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 9 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Livy. 1919– *History of Rome.* Translated by B. O. Foster et al. 14 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pausanias. 1918–35. *Descriptions of Greece*. Translated by W. H. S. Jones et al. LCL. 5 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Philo. 1929. *On the Cherubim. The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain. The Worse Attacks the Better. On the Posterity and Exile of Cain. On the Giants.* Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1929. *On the Creation. Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis 2 and 3.* Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1930. *On the Unchangeableness of God. On Husbandry. Concerning Noah's Work As a Planter. On Drunkenness. On Sobriety.* Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1932. *On the Confusion of Tongues. On the Migration of Abraham. Who Is the Heir of Divine Things? On Mating with the Preliminary Studies.* Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1934. *On Flight and Finding. On the Change of Names. On Dreams.* Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1935. *On Abraham. On Joseph. On Moses.* Translated by F. H. Colson. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1937. *On the Decalogue. On the Special Laws, Books 1-3.* Translated by F. H. Colson. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1939. *On the Special Laws, Book 4. On the Virtues. On Rewards and Punishments.* Translated by F. H. Colson. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1962. *On the Embassy to Gaius. General Indexes.* Translated by F. H. Colson. Index by J. W. Earp. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pindar. 1997. *Nemean Odes. Isthmian Odes. Fragments*. Edited and translated by William H. Race. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Plato. 1926. *Laws.* Translated by R. G. Bury. LCL. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———.1929. *Timaeus. Critias. Cleitophon. Menexenus. Epistles.* Translated by R. G. Bury. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pliny the Elder. 1938–1963. *Natural History*. Translated by H. Rackham et al. LCL. 10 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Plutarch. 1914–1926. *Lives*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. 11 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1927–2004. *Moralia*. Translated by F. C. Babbitt et al. 17 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Procopius. 1940. *On Buildings. General Index.* Translated by H. B. Dewing, Glanville Downey. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Seneca. 1917. *Epistles, Volume I: Epistles 1-65.* Translated by Richard M. Gummere. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sophocles. 1994. *Ajax. Electra. Oedipus Tyrannus*. Edited and translated by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1994. *Antigone. The Women of Trachis. Philoctetes. Oedipus at Colonus*. Edited and translated by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Strabo. 1917–1932. *Geography*. Translated by H. L. Jones. 8 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Thucydides. 1919–1923. *History of the Peloponnesian War.* Translated by C. F. Smith. LCL. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Virgil. 1999. *Eclogues. Georgics. Aeneid: Books 1–6*. Translated by H. R. Fairclough. Revised by G. P. Goold. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Xenophon. 1914. *Cyropaedia.* Translated by Walter Miller. LCL. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 2013. *Memorabilia. Oeconomicus. Symposium. Apology*. Translated by E. C. Marchant. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adams, Edward, and David G. Horrell, eds. 2004. *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Athanassiadi, Polymnia, and Michael Frede, eds. 1999. *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aune, David. 1983. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Avioz, Michael. 2016. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Books of Samuel*. Library of Second Temple Studies. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Barclay, John. 1996. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE - 117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Barrett, C.K. 1971. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2nd ed. BNTC. London: Adam and Charles Black.

Bartchy, S. Scott. 1973. *Mallon Chresai: First-Century Slavery and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7:21*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 11. Missoula: The Society of Biblical Literature for the Seminar on Paul.

Bauckham, Richard. 2003. "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran and the Essenes." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers*

from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001, edited by James Davila. STDJ 46. Leiden: Brill.

Baugh, Steven M. 1999. "Cult Prostitution in New Testament Ephesus: A Reappraisal." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 42 (3): 443–60.

Beale, G. K. 2004. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. New Studies in Biblical Theology. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Beard, Mary, and John Henderson. 1998. "With This Body I Thee Worship: Sacred Prostitution in Antiquity." In *Gender and the Body in the Ancient Mediterranean*, 56–79. Gender & History. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Beard, Mary, John A. North, and Simon Price. 1998. *Religions of Rome. Vol. 1: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Begg, Christopher. 2000. *Josephus' Story of the Later Monarchy*. BETL 144. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 2005. *Flavius Josephus Judean Antiquities 5-7*. Edited by Steve Mason. Vol. 4. Flavius Josephus – Translation and Commentary. Leiden: Brill.

Bekken, Per Jarle. 2014. "Philo's Relevance for the Study of the New Testament." In *Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria*, edited by Torrey Seland, 226–67. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. 2013. "Purity Matters in the Book of Chronicles." In *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber*, edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson, and Eileen Schuller, 37–52. WUNT 305. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Bendlin, Andreas. 2007. "Purity and Pollution." In *A Companion to Greek Religion*, edited by Daniel Ogden, 178–89. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Berger, Klaus. 1970. 'Zu Den Sogennanten Sätzen Heiligen Rechts." *New Testament Studies* 17: 10–40.

Bitner, Bradley J. 2015a. "Coinage and Colonial Identity: Corinthian Numismatics and the Corinthian Correspondence." In *The First Urban Churches 1: Methodological Foundations*, edited by James R. Harrison and L.L. Welborn, 151–87. Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplement Series 7. Atlanta: SBL Press.

———. 2015b. *Paul's Political Strategy in 1 Corinthians 1-4: Constitution and Covenant*. SNTSMS 163. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Blackwell, Benjamin. 2010. "Immortal Glory and the Problem of Death in Romans 3:23." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (3): 285–308.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Robert Funk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bonnington, Mark. 2004. "New Temples in Corinth: Paul's Use of Temple Imagery in the Ethics of the Corinthian Correspondence." In *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*, edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole, 151–59. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.

Böttrich, Christfried. 1999. "Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus." In *Gemeinde Ohne Tempel, Community Without Temple: Zue Substituierung Und Transformation Des Jerusalemer Tempels Und Seines Kults Im Alten Testament, Antiken Judentum Und Frühen Christentum*, 411–25. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Boyarin, Daniel. 1997. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Oakland: University of California Press.

Boyer, James L. 1981. '"First Class Conditions: What Do They Mean?" *Grace Theological Journal* 2 (1): 75–114.

Brenneman, Laura. 2005. "Corporate Discipline and the People of God: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5:3-5." PhD diss., Durham: University of Durham.

Brighton, Mark Andrews. 2009. *The Sicarii in Josephus's 'Judean War': Rhetorical Analysis and Historical Observations*. EJL 27. Atlanta: Society of Biblical LIterature.

Brooke, George J. 2014. "2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 Again: A Change in Perspective." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature*, edited by Jean-Sébastien Rey, 1–16. STDJ 102. Leiden: Brill.

Brookins, Timothy. 2014. *Corinthian Wisdom, Stoic Philosophy, and the Ancient Economy*. SNTSMS 159. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brookins, Timothy, and Bruce Longenecker. 2016. *1 Corinthians 1-9: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. BHGNT. Waco: Baylor University Press.

Brower, Kent. 2009. *Living As God's Holy People: Holiness and Community in Paul*. 2008 Didsbury Lectures. London: Paternoster.

Bruce, F.F. 1971. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. New Century Bible. London: Butler and Tanner Ltd.

Buck, C.D. 1955. *Greek Dialects*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Budin, Stephanie L. 2006. "Sacred Prostitution in the First Person." In *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, 77–92. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

———. 2008. *The Myth of Sacred Prostitution in Antiquity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bultmann, Rudolf. 1910. *Der Stil Der Paulinischen Predigt Und Die Kynisch-Stoische Diatribe*. FRLANT. Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2007. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. Waco: Baylor University Press.

Burford, Alison. 1969. *The Greek Temple Builders at Epidauros*. Liverpool Monographs in Archaeology and Oriental Studies. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Burk, Denny. 2008. "Discerning Corinthian Slogans Through Paul's Use of the Diatribe in 1 Corinthians 6:12-20." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 18 (1): 99–121.

Burkert, Walter. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Translated by John Raffan. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Byrne, Brendan. 1983. "Sinning Against One's Own Body: Paul's Understanding of the Sexual Relationship in 1 Corinthians 6:18." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (4): 608–16.

Byron, John. 2007. "Slaughter, Fratricide and Sacrilege: Cain and Abel Traditions in 1 John 3." *Biblica* 88 (4): 526–35.

Cameron, Alan. 2011. *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, Barth Lynn. 1993. "Flesh and Spirit in 1 Cor 5:5: An Exercise in Rhetorical Criticism of the NT." *JETS* 36 (3): 331–42.

Campbell, Constantine. 2012. *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek 13. New York: Peter Lang.

Caragounis, Chrys C. 2006. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Cardauns, Burkhart, ed. 1976. *M. Terentius Varro: Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum. Teil I: Die Fragmente*. Weisbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Cerfaux, Lucien. 1959. *The Church in the Theology of St Paul*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Chaniotis, Angelos. 2012. "Greek Ritual Purity: From Automatisms to Moral Distinctions." In *How Purity Is Made*, edited by Petra Rösch and Udo Simon, 123–40. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Ciampa, Roy E., and Brian S. Rosner. 2010. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Clarke, Andrew. 2006. *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-6*. 2nd ed. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. 1980. "The Function of 'Excommunication' in Paul." *HTR* 73 (1–2): 251–63.

Collins, Raymond. 1999. *1 Corinthians*. Sacra Pagina 7. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

Colwell, E.C. 1933. "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 52 (1): 12–21.

Concannon, Cavan W. 2014. *"When You Were Gentiles": Specters of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul's Corinthian Correspondence*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Conybeare, William, and John Howson. 1874. *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. Vol. 2. New York: Scribner.

Conzelmann, Hans. 1967. "Korinth und die Mädchen der Aphrodite: Zur Religionsgeschichte der Stadt Korinth." *Nachrichten Der Akademie Der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse*, no. 8: 245–61.

———. 1975. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

———. 1987. *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald Juel. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Coppens, J.C. 1973. "The Spiritual Temple in the Pauline Letters and Its Background." *StEv* 6: 53–66.

Cornelis de Vos, J. 2018. "Murder as Sacrilege. Philo of Alexandria on the Prohibition of Killing." In *"You Shall Not Kill": The Prohibition of Killing in Ancient Religions and Cultures*, edited by J. Cornelis de Vos and Hermut Löhr, 142–58. Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 27. Göttingen: V&R Academic.

Daly, Robert. 1978. *The Origins of Christian Sacrifice*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

DeGrado, Jessie. 2018. "The Qdesha in Hosea 4:14: Putting the (Myth of the) Sacred Prostitute to Bed." *VT* 68 (1): 8–40.

Deissmann, Adolf. 1929. *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*. Translated by Lionel R.M. Strachan. Fourth ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

DeMaris, Richard E. 2008. "Contrition and Correction or Elimination and Purification in 1 Corinthians 5?" In *The Social Sciences and Biblical Translation*, edited by Dietmar Neufeld, 39–50. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 41. Atlanta: SBL.

DeNeui, Mark W. 2008. "The Body, The Building and the Field: Paul's Metaphors for the Church in 1 Corinthians in Light of Their Usage in Greco-Roman Literature." PhD diss., Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen.

Dijkhuizen, Petra. 2016. "The Lord's Supper and Ritual Theory: Interpreting 1 Corinthians 11:30 in Terms of Risk, Failure, and Efficacy." *Neotestamentica* 50 (2): 441–76.

Dodd, C.H. 1932. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. Moffatt New Testament Commentary 6. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Donfried, Karl P. 1976. "Justification and Last Judgment in Paul." *Zeitschrift für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 67 (1–2): 90–110.

Downs, David J. 2019. "Physical Weakness, Illness and Death in 1 Corinthians 11.30: Deprivation and Overconsumption in Pauline and Early Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 65 (4): 572–88.

Eastman, Susan Grove. 2017. *Paul and the Person*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Edsall, Benjamin A. 2013. “Paul’s Rhetoric of Knowledge: The OYK OIΔATE Question in 1 Corinthians.” *Novum Testamentum* 55 (3): 252–71.

Eger, Otto. 1918. “Rechtswörter und Rechtsbilder in den Paulinischen Briefen.” *Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft Und Die Kunde Der Älteren Kirche* 18: 84–108.

———. 1919. *Rechtsgeschichtliches Zum Neuen Testament*. Basel: F. Reinhardt.

Ehrenkrook, Jason von. 2011. *Sculpting Idolatry in Flavian Rome: (An)Iconic Rhetoric in the Writings of Flavius Josephus*. EJL 33. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Eisenbaum, Pamela. 2009. *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle*. New York: HarperOne.

Ellis, E. 1990. “Sōma in First Corinthians.” *Interpretation* 44 (2):132–44.

Engels, Donald W. 1990. *Roman Corinth: An Alternative Model for the Classical City*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Fee, Gordon D. 1987. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

———. 1994. *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

Feeney, Dennis. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*. Roman Literature and Its Contexts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feldman, Louis. 1998. *Josephus’s Interpretation of the Bible*. HCS. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Findlay, G.G. 1897. *1 Corinthians*. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Vol. 2. Expositor’s Greek Testament Commentary. New York: George H. Doran Company.

Fisk, Bruce N. 1996. “ΠΟΡΝΕΥΕΙΝ As Body Violation: The Unique Nature of Sexual Sin in 1 Corinthians 6.18.” *New Testament Studies* 42 (4): 540–58.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 2008. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Yale Bible 32. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Fowden, Garth. 1988. “Between Pagans and Christians.” *The Journal of Roman Studies* 78:173–82.

———. 1993. *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1998. 'Polytheism and Philosophy'. In *The Late Empire, A.D. 337-425*, edited by Averil Cameron and Peter Garnsey, 538–60. CAH 13. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, Robin Lane. 2011. *Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean World from the Second Century AD to the Conversion of Constantine*. London: Penguin Books.

Frayer-Griggs, Daniel. 2016. *Saved Through Fire: The Fiery Ordeal in New Testament Eschatology*. Eugene: Pickwick Publications.

Fredriksen, Paula. 2010. "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 56 (2): 232–52.

———. 2015. "The Question of Worship: Gods, Pagans, and the Redemption of Israel." In *Paul Within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*, edited by Mark D. Nanos and Magnus Zetterholm. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

———. 2017. *Paul: The Pagans' Apostle*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Friesen, Steven J., and James C. Walters, eds. 2010. *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. SNT 134. Leiden: Brill.

Frymer-Kensky, Tikva. 1983. "Pollution, Purification, and Purgation in Ancient Israel." In *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by Carol L. Meyers and M. O'Connor, 399–414. 1. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Gager, John. 2000. *Reinventing Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garland, David E. 2003. *1 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Gärtner, Bertil. 1965. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*. SNTSMS 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gaston, Lloyd. 1970. *No Stone on Another*. NovTSup 23. Leiden: Brill.

Gildersleeve, Basil L. 1876. "On Ei with the Future Indicative and Ἐάν With the Subjunctive in the Tragic Poets." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 7: 5–23.

Goulder, Michael. 1991. "ΣΟΦΙΑ in 1 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 37 (4): 516–34.

Gundry, Robert Horton. 1976. *Soma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*. SNTSMS. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Günther, Linda-Marie. 2013. "Concepts of Purity in Ancient Greece, With Particular Emphasis on Sacred Sites." In *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, edited by Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan, 245–60. Dynamics in the History of Religions 3. Leiden: Brill.

Gupta, Nijay. 2010. *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 175. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hadas-Lebel, Mireille. 2012. *Philo of Alexandria: A Thinker in the Jewish Diaspora*. Translated by Robyn Fréchet. Studies in Philo of Alexandria 7. Leiden: Brill.

Harder, Günther. 1964. "Φθείρω, Φθορά, Φθαρτός, Ἄφθαρτος, Ἀφθαρσία, Ἀφθορία, Διαφθείρω, Διαφθορά, Καταφθείρω." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, and Gerhard Friedrich, 9:93–106. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Harner, Philip. 1973. "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1): 75–87.

Harrington, Hannah. 2019. *The Purity and Sanctuary of the Body in Second Temple Judaism*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Harrington, Hannah K. 1993. *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations*. SBLDS 143. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Harrison, James R., and L.L. Welborn, eds. 2015. *The First Urban Churches 1: Methodological Foundations*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplement Series 7. Atlanta: SBL Press.

———, eds. 2016. *The First Urban Churches 2: Roman Corinth*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplement Series 8. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Harrison, Thomas. 1997. "Herodotus and the Certainty of Divine Retribution." In *What Is a God?: Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity*, edited by Alan B. Lloyd, 101–21. London: Duckworth.

Hays, Richard B. 1997. *First Corinthians*. IBC. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press.

Hengel, Martin. 1969. *Judentum Und Hellenismus*. WUNT 10. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Hill, David. 1979. *New Testament Prophecy*. New Foundations Theological Library. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.

Hodge, Caroline Johnson. 2005. “Apostle to the Gentiles: Constructions of Paul’s Identity.” *Biblical Interpretation* 13 (3): 270–88.

———. 2007. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Stury of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2015. “The Question of Identity: Gentiles as Gentiles—but Also Not—in Pauline Communities.” In *Paul Within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*, edited by Mark D. Nanos and Magnus Zetterholm, 153–74. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Hogeterp, Albert L. A. 2006. *Paul and God’s Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*. BTS 2. Leuven: Peeters.

Hollander, Harm W. 1994. “The Testing by Fire of the Builders’ Works: 1 Corinthians 3.10–15.” *New Testament Studies* 40 (1): 89–104.

Horsley, Richard. 1998. *1 Corinthians*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Hurd, John. 1965. *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*. London: SPCK.

Ipsen, Avaren. 2009. *Sex Working and the Bible*. BibleWorld. London: Routledge.

Jackson, Walter. 2018. “Glory in the Letter of Paul to the Romans: Purity, Honor, and Eschatology.” PhD diss., University of Edinburgh.

Jewett, Robert, and Roy David. 2006. *Romans: A Commentary on the Book of Romans*. Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Jiménez, Miguel Requena. 2018. “Prodigies in Republican Rome. The Absence of God.” *Klio* 100 (2): 480–500.

Karatas, Aynur-Michele-Sara. 2020. “Greek Cults and Their Sacred Laws on Dress-Code: The Laws of Greek Sanctuaries for Hairstyles, Jewelry, Make-up, Belts, and Shoes.” *Classical World* 113 (2): 147–70.

Käsemann, Ernst. 1955. “Sätze Heiligen Rechtes im Neuen Testament.” *New Testament Studies* 1 (4): 248–60.

———. 1964. “The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord’s Supper.” In *Essays on New Testament Themes*, translated by W.J. Montague, 108–35. London: SCM Press.

Keener, Craig. 2005. *1-2 Corinthians*. NCBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2012. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Volume 4: 24:1-28:31.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Kempthorne, Ruth. 1968. “Incest and the Body of Christ: A Study of 1 Corinthians 6:12-20.” *New Testament Studies* 14 (4): 568–74.

Ker, Donald P. 2000. “Paul and Apollos—Colleagues or Rivals.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 22 (77): 75–97.

Kindt, Julia. 2012. *Rethinking Greek Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klawans, Jonathan. 1995. “Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism.” *AJS Review* 20 (2): 285–312.

———. 1997. “The Impurity of Immorality in Ancient Judaism.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 48 (1): 1–16.

———. 2000. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2006. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2012. *Josephus and the Theologies of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kleine, Werner. 2002. *Zwischen Furcht und Hoffnung: Eine Textlinguistische Untersuchung des Briefes 2 Kor 1-9 zur Wechselseitigen Bedeutsamkeit der Beziehung von Apostel und Gemeinde*. BBB 141. Berlin: Philo Verlagsgesellschaft.

Klinzing, Georg. 1971. *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament*. SUNT 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kremer, Jacob. 1997. *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*. Regensburg: F. Pustet.

Kruse, Colin G. 2012. *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Kuck, D.W. 1992. *Judgment and Community Conflict: Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5*. NovTSup 66. Leiden: Brill.

Lakey, Michael. 2019. *The Ritual World of Paul the Apostle*. LNTS 602. London: T & T Clark.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner. 1989. *More Than Cool Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lambrecht, Jan. 2009. '"Paul's Reasoning in 1 Corinthians 6.12-20." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 85 (4): 479–86.

Lanci, John R. 1997. *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*. Studies in Biblical Literature. New York: Peter Lang.

———. 2005. "The Stones Don't Speak and the Texts Tell Lies: Sacred Sex at Corinth." In *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*, 205–20. HTS 53. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lang, Friedrich. 1994. *Die Briefe an Die Korinther*. NTD 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Levison, John. 2006. "The Spirit and the Temple in Paul's Letters to the Corinthians." In *Paul and His Theology*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 3: 189–215. Pauline Studies. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2009. *Filled with the Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Lietzmann, D. Hans. 1969. *An Die Korinther*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Mohr.

Lim, Kar Yong. 2010. "Paul's Use of Temple Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence: The Creation of Christian Identity." In *Reading Paul in Context: Explorations in Identity Formation. Essays in Honour of William S. Campbell.*, 189–208. London: T & T Clark.

Lindemann, Andreas. 2000. *Der Erste Korintherbrief*. Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Liu, Yulin. 2013. *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians*. WUNT 2 343. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Lupu, Eran. 2009. *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents (NGSL)*. 2nd ed. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 152. Boston: Brill.

Macaskill, Grant. 2013. *Union with Christ in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Malherbe, Abraham J (Abraham Johannes). 1980. "Mē Genoito in the Diatribe and Paul." *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1–2): 231–40.

Marshall, I. Howard. 1978. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Martin, Dale. 1990. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christiniaty*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

———. 1995. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Mason, Steve. 2013. "Pollution and Purification in Josephus' Judean War." In *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber*, edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson, and Eileen Schuller, 187–207. WUNT 305. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

———. 2016a. "Josephus as a Roman Historian." In *A Companion to Josephus*, edited by Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers, 89–107. Malden: Wiley Blackwell.

———. 2016b. "Josephus's Judean War." In *A Companion to Josephus*, edited by Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers, 13–35. Malden: Wiley Blackwell.

McKelvey, R. J. 1969. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford Theological Monographs. London: Oxford University Press.

Miguens, M. 1975. "Christ's 'Members' and Sex (1 Cor 6.12-20)." *The Thomist* 39 (1): 24–48.

Mihaila, Corin. 2009. *The Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul's Stance Toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric: An Exegetical and Socio-Historical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-4*. LNTS 402. London: T&T Clark.

Milgrom, Jacob. 1976. "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Gray.'" *Revue Biblique* 83: 390–99.

———. 1992. *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3. New York: Doubleday.

Mitchell, Margaret Mary. 1993. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. 1st American ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Mitchell, Stephen, and Peter van Nuffelen, eds. 2010. *One God: Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morris, Leon. 1988. *The Epistle to the Romans*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Moule, Charles. 1953. *An Idiom Book of the Greek New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. 1978. "Corinthian Slogans in 1 Cor 6:12-20" *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (3): 391–96.

———. 1979. *1 Corinthians*. NTM 10. Wilmington: Michael Glazier.

———. 2002. *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*. 3rd ed. GNS 6. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.

———. 2009. "Works Without Faith in 1 Corinthians 7:14." In *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues*, 43–57. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nanos, Mark D. 2017. *Reading Paul Within Judaism*. Collected Essays of Mark D. Nanos. Eugene: Cascade Books.

Nanos, Mark D., and Magnus Zetterholm, eds. 2015. *Paul Within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostles*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Naselli, Andrew David. 2017. "Is Every Sin Outside the Body except Immoral Sex? Weighing Whether 1 Corinthians 6:18b is Paul's Statement or a Corinthian Slogan." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 136 (4): 969–87.

Newman, Carey. 1992. *Paul's Glory-Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2019. *God and Glory and Paul, Again: Divine Identity and Community Formation in the Early Jesus Movement*. Paper Presented at the New Testament Seminar of the University of St Andrews, April 19.

Newton, Michael. 1985. *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Niehoff, Maren. 2018. *Philo of Alexandria: An Intellectual Biography*. The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven: Yale University Press.

North, John A. 2005. “Pagans, Polytheists, and the Pendulum.” In *The Spread of Christianity in the First Four Centuries: Essays in Explanation*, edited by W.V. Harris. Vol. 27. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition. Leiden: Brill.

Novenson, Matthew. 2020. “The Universal Polytheism and the Case of the Jews.” In *Monotheism and Christology in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, 32–60. NovTSup 180. Leiden: Brill.

Olson, Ryan. 2010. *Tragedy, Authority, and Trickery: The Poetics of Embedded Letters in Josephus*. Hellenic Studies 42. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Orrey, McFarland. 2016. *God and Grace in Philo and Paul*. NovTSup 164. Leiden: Brill.

Parker, Robert. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pervo, Richard. 2009. *Acts: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Peterson, David. 2009. *The Acts of the Apostles*. The Pillar New Testament Comentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Petrovic, Andrej, and Ivana Petrovic. 2016. *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion. Volume I: Early Greek Religion*. First edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pettegrew, David K. 2016. *The Isthmus of Corinth: Crossroads of the Mediterranean World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Porter, Stanley. 1989. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament: With Reference to Tense and Mood*. Studies in Biblical Greek 1. New York: Peter Lang.

———. 1999. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. London: Continuum.

Rajak, Tessa. 2001. “Jews and Greeks: The Invention and Exploitation of Polarities in the Nineteenth Century.” In *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Roman: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*, 535–57. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 48. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2002. *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*. 2nd ed. London: Duckworth.

Ramelli, Ilaria. 2011. “Spiritual Weakness, Illness, and Death in 1 Corinthians 11:30.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130 (1): 145–63.

Regev, Eyal. 2007. *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. RelSoc 45. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2019. *The Temple in Early Christianity*. AYBRL. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Richardson, Philip N. 2018. *Temple of the Living God: The Influence of Hellenistic Philosophy on Paul's Figurative Temple Language Applied to the Corinthians*. Eugene: Pickwick Publications.

Robertson, Archibald, and Alfred Plummer. 1950. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*. 2nd ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Robertson, Noel. 2013. "The Concept of Purity in Greek Sacred Laws." In *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, edited by Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan, 195–243. Dynamics in the History of Religions 3. Leiden: Brill.

Robinson, John A.T. 1952. *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology*. SBT 5. London: SCM Press.

Robinson, Jonathan Rivett. 2018. "The Argument Against Attributing Slogans in 1 Corinthians 6:12-20." *Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters* 8 (1–2): 147–66.

Rosner, Brian S. 1991. "Temple and Holiness in 1 Corinthians 5." *Tyndale Bulletin* 42 (1): 137–45.

———. 1992. "A Possible Quotation of Test. Reuben 5:5 in 1 Corinthians 6:18A." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 43 (1): 123–27.

———. 1994. *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5-7*. AGJU 22. Leiden: Brill.

Runge, Steven E. 2010. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Lexham Bible Reference Series. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing.

Sampley, J. Paul. 2002. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. NIB 10. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Sandelin, Karl-Gustav. 2014. "Philo as a Jew." In *Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria*, edited by Torrey Seland, 19–46. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Schneider, Sebastian. 1996. "Glaubensmängel in Korinth. Eine Neue Deutung der 'Schwachen, Kranken, Schlafenden' in 1 Kor 11:30." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 9: 3–19.

Schowalter, Daniel N., and Steven J. Friesen, eds. 2005. *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. HTS 53. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Divinity School.

Schrage, Wolfgang. 2008a. *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. EKK 7. Ostfildern: Patmos Verlag.

———. 2008b. *Der Erste Brief an Die Korinther*. Vol 2. 2 vols. EKK 7. Ostfildern: Patmos Verlag.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. 1976. "Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (2): 159–77.

Schwartz, Seth. 2001. *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Senft, C. 1990. *La Première Éître de Saint Paul Aux Corinthiens*. 2nd ed. Commentaire Du Nouveau Testament. Geneva: Labor et Fides.

Shanor, Jay. 1988. "Paul as Master Builder: Construction Terms in First Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 34: 461–71.

Siegert, Folker. 2009. "Philo and the New Testament." In *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, edited by Adam Kamesar, 175–209. Cambridge Companions to Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smit, Joop F. M. 2002. "'What Is Apollos? What Is Paul?': In Search for the Coherence of First Corinthians 1:10-4:21." *Novum Testamentum* 44 (3): 231–51.

Smith, Jay. 2008. "The Roots of a 'libertine' Slogan in I Corinthians 6:18." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 59 (1): 63–95.

———. 2010. "Slogans in 1 Corinthians." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 167 (665): 68–88.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. 1920. *Greek Grammar for Colleges*. New York: American Book Company.

Soskice, Janet. 1985. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Spawforth, Anthony. 1996. "Roman Corinth: The Formation of a Colonial Elite." In *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East: Social and Political Aspects: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Organized by the Finnish Institute and the Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity, Athens, 7-9 September 1993*, edited by A.D. Rizakis, 167–82. 21.

Athens: Research Center for Greek and Roman Antiquity National Hellenic Research Foundation.

Stowers, Stanley. 1981. *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*. SBL Dissertation Series 57. Chico: Scholars Press.

———. 1994. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, & Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Strack, Wolfram. 1994. *Kultische Terminologie in Ekklesiologischen Kontexten in Den Briefen Des Paulus*. Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum.

Suh, Michael. 2020. *Power and Peril: Paul's Use of Temple Discourse in 1 Corinthians*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 239. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Swete, Henry. 1921. *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament: A Study of Primitive Christian Teaching*. London: MacMillan.

Talbert, Charles. 2002. *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Macon: Smyth & Helwys.

Testa, Rita Lizzi. 2013. "When the Romans Became Pagani." In *The Strange Death of Rome*, 31–51. Giornale Italiano di Fililogia Bibliotheca 16. Turnhout: Brepols.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. 1967. *Josephus: The Man and the Historian*. New York: Ktav.

Thiessen, Matthew. 2020. *Jesus and the Forces of Death*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Thiselton, Anthony C. 2000. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Vahrenhorst, Martin. 2008. *Kultische Sprache in den Paulusbriefen*. WUNT 230. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Walker, William. 2001. *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*. JSNTSup 213. London: Sheffield Academic Press.

Wallace, Daniel B. 1996. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Wardle, Timothy. 2010. *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*. WUNT 2 291. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Wassen, Cecilia. 2013. “Do You Have to Be Pure in a Metaphorical Temple? Sanctuary Metaphors and Construction of Sacred Space in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Paul’s Letters.” In *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity*, edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson, and Eileen Schuller, 55–86. WUNT 305. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Weiss, Johannes. 1925. *Der Erste Korintherbrief*. 10. Aufl. Kritisch-Exegitischer Kommentar Über das Neue Testament, Abt. 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Weissenrieder, Annette. 2012. “‘Do You Not Know That You Are God’s Temple?’ Towards a New Perspective on Paul’s Temple Image in 1 Corinthians 3:16.” In *Contested Spaces: Houses and Temples in Roman Antiquity and the New Testament*, 377–411. WUNT 285. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Welborn, L.L. 2005. *Paul, the Fool of Christ*. JSNTSup 293. London: T & T Clark International.

Wenschkewitz, Hans. 1932. *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priest und Opfer im Neuen Testament*. Angelos-Beiheft 4. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer.

Williams, H. H. Drake. 2001. *The Wisdom of the Wise: The Presence and Function of Scripture within 1 Cor 1:18-3:23*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 49. Leiden: Brill.

Williger, Eduard. 1922. *Hagios*. RGVV, 19.1. Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann.

Winter, Bruce W. 2001. *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

———. 2002. *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Witherington, Ben. 1995. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Wöhrle, Jakob. 2020. “‘If you Want to do Good.’ Genesis 4:6–7 in the Context of the Story of Cain and Abel.” In *And God Saw That It Was Good (Gen 1:12): The Concept of Quality in Archaeology, Philology and Theology*, edited by Filip Čapek and Petr Sláma, 139–52. Beiträge Zum Verstehen Der Bibel/Contributions to Understanding the Bible 42. Zürich: Lit Verlag.

Wolff, Christian. 1996. *Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Worthington, Jonathan. 2011. *Creation in Paul and Philo*. WUNT 2 317. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Wright, David. 1992. “Unclean and Clean.” In *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman, 729–45. New York: Doubleday.

Wright, N.T. 1992. *The New Testament and the People of God*. COQG 1. London: SPCK.

———. 2011. *The Kingdom New Testament*. New York: HarperOne.

———. 2013a. “Mind, Spirit, Soul and Body: All for One and One for All—Reflections on Paul’s Anthropology in His Complex Contents.” In *Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul, 1978-2013*, Fortress Press edition, 455–73. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

———. 2013b. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God, volume 4. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Yinger, Kent L. 1999. *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds*. SNTSMS 105. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.