

CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE

The Claims of the New Life in Christ (1 Corinthians 6:12–20)

THE LARGER CONTEXT

In 1 Corinthians 6:1–8 Paul leaves the matter of sexual morality and treats another issue perhaps brought to his mind by the reference to “judging those inside the church” in 5:12. The issue in 6:1–8 is the lawsuits between Christians which are being brought into court before pagan judges. Paul regrets that such disputes exist (vv. 7–8), but if they are inevitable, believers should use one of their own members to settle them (vs. 5).

Then Paul goes on to give a catalogue of types of evildoers who will not enter the kingdom of God (vv. 9–11). Once the Corinthians were such as these but now they have been washed, sanctified, and justified (vs. 11). The connection with 6:1–8 is the link between ἀδικέω in vv. 7–8 and ἄδικοι in vs. 9: that brother is “wronging” brother leads Paul to warn “wrongdoers” of their fate.

The inclusion of “fornicators” in the list of vs. 9 leads Paul back again to the theme of sexual immorality in 6:12–20. Whereas in 5:1–8 he dealt with a concrete case, now he deals with a principle by which some Corinthians seem to be living (Barrett, p. 144).

NOTES

verse 12

Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν—ἔξεστιν: impersonal verb, 3rd sing. of the unused ἔξεμι, “it is permitted; it is possible; it is proper” (AG, p. 274). RSV puts these words in quotation marks because most scholars agree (including older ones such as Calvin, p. 128) that Paul is quoting a maxim which the Corinthians used to justify their immorality. See earlier, p. 295. Alford (p. 516) insists they “are the bona fide words of the apostle himself, not, as some have understood them, the saying of an opponent cited by him.” There could be truth in both interpretations if the Corinthians had taken the slogan from Paul’s own teach-

ing and misused it (Conzelmann, p. 109; Barrett, p. 145). This slogan, also found in 10:23, is part of the evidence for seeing an “incipient gnosticism” or a “gnosticizing party” at Corinth. Irenaeus says of the Gnostics, “These men, while they boast of Jesus as being their Master, do in fact emulate the philosophy of Epicurus and the indifference of the Cynics” (*Adv. Haer.* 2.32.3). On the question of Gnosticism in Corinth, see W. Schmithals’ book by that name and R. McL. Wilson’s qualifications in *Gnosis and the New Testament*, pp. 51–55; and “How Gnostic were the Corinthians?” *NTS*, 19 (1972–73), 65–74. See earlier, pp. 172f., 322f. In context “all things are lawful for me” means “that they abused their liberty to such an extent that they stretched it to include fornication” (Calvin, p. 128).

ἀλλ’ οὐ πάντα συμφέρει—συμφέρω = “bring together, help, be advantageous or profitable or useful” (AG, p. 787). Cf. 10:23; 12:7; 2 Cor. 8:10; 12:1. Paul does not directly deny the slogan, but inserts his own qualification, the meaning of which is shown in 10:23 and 12:7. Note the link between συμφέρω and οἰκοδομέω and ἀγάπη in 10:23 and 8:1. Love governs the use of freedom (cf. Gal. 5:13; Barrett, p. 145). Conzelmann (p. 109n6&11) maintains that Paul is using Stoic terminology in his qualification of the Corinthian slogan.

ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπὸ τινος—Note the emphatic ἐγώ. Ἐξουσιασθήσομαι: the morpheme -θησ- is a certain clue for parsing. Do not construe the “ε” as an augment. The verb is ἐξουσιάζω = “to have the right or power for something or over someone” (AG, p. 278). For this class of verb (stem ending in “ζ”) see HNTG §24.251ff. and Paradigm V-4a. Would you construe τινος as neuter or masculine?

“To use things indifferent so that they become by habit indispensable is the very negation of freedom: indulgence of passions as indifferent leads to slavery to the passions” (Parry, p. 101). “Licence is not more but less than liberty” (Barrett, p. 146).

verse 13

τὰ βρώματα τῇ κοιλίᾳ, καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασιν· ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ ταύτην καὶ ταῦτα καταργήσει—Τὸ βρῶμα = “food” (AG, p. 147). Κοιλία = “belly, stomach, womb” (AG, p. 438). The antecedents of ταύτην and ταῦτα can be identified by the fact that one is fem. sing. and one is neut. pl. We must either supply the verb “are” and “is” in the first two clauses or translate them like exclamations: “Foods for the belly and the belly for foods!” What kind of datives are κοιλίᾳ and βρώμασιν (HNTG §35.3233)? The verb of the third clause is καταργέω = “make ineffective, powerless; abolish, wipe out, set aside” (AG, p. 418). On “contract verbs” see HNTG Paradigm V-1b. The “σ” tense sign with no augment and the ending -ει can only be one tense.

Barrett (p. 146) and Bruce (pp. 62f.) view these three clauses as part

of the rationale presented by the “gnosticizing party” (“spiritual libertines,” Moffatt, p. 69) for their freedom from any food laws. Why does the RSV not include, “God will abolish both” in quotation marks? Paul does not seem to deny the validity of the argument “as far as food laws are concerned” (Barrett, p. 147). The transiency of food and digestion does relativize food laws: cf. 8:8; Rom. 14:17; Mark 7:18f. But see Gundry’s argument (pp. 55f.) that Paul denies “that the mortal body in any of its parts is unimportant.”

Paul mentions food in a context relating mainly to fornication because “he knew that for some of them the corollary held good: ‘sexual relations for the body and the body for sexual relations’” (Bruce, pp. 62f.). Since “there is no resurrection” of the body (15:12), then “nothing concerning corporeal life is of any importance for the spiritual life and for the destiny of the soul. This is why even debauchery and other carnal excesses cannot defile the spirit, which alone inherits the Kingdom” (Héring, p. 44). So went the gnostic argument. But Paul denies the validity of it in what follows.

τὸ δὲ σῶμα οὐ τῇ πορνείᾳ ἀλλὰ τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ὁ κύριος τῷ σώματι—The corollary to vs. 13a is not “the body for fornication and fornication for the body!” but rather “the body for the Lord and the Lord for the body!” “Belly and eating, yes; but not, body and fornication” (Barrett, p. 147).

Is not the stomach part of the body so that Paul could have said, “the stomach for the Lord and the Lord for the stomach!”? Does the adverbative δὲ mean that Paul sees a contrast between the stomach and the body (RP, p. 123) or does it mean “*despite* the physical nature and ultimate destruction of the present body, it *nevertheless* is meant for the Lord rather than for immorality” (Gundry, p. 55)? With this question the much larger issue of the meaning of σῶμα in Pauline anthropology is raised. Bultmann (pp. 194f.) has been extremely influential here in arguing that “*sōma* = self, person” or “your body means you.” He has been followed in this by many scholars: Moule, p. 197; Morris, p. 100 (“body is the whole personality, man as person meant for God”); Barrett, p. 147 (“the *body* is myself”); Conzelmann, p. 110 (“I am *sōma* inasmuch as I am not a ‘thing’ but enter a relationship”); Ladd, p. 464 (“Man, his person as a whole, can be denoted by *sōma*”).

Gundry’s book deals this interpretation an extremely powerful blow. His conclusion is that in neither the Pauline Epistles, nor the literature of the New Testament outside those Epistles, nor the LXX, nor extra-biblical ancient Greek literature, does the definition “whole person” find convincing support. “The *sōma* may represent the whole person simply because the *sōma* lives in union with the soul/spirit. But *sōma* does not mean ‘whole person,’ because its use is designed to call attention to the physical object which is the body of the person rather than the whole personality. Where used of whole people, *sōma*

directs attention to their bodies, not to the wholeness of their being” (pp. 79f.). On our verse Gundry offers four arguments why no contrast is intended between stomach and body. The point is the same for both: relation to the Lord not physical appetite should govern the Christian (pp. 55f.).

For the meaning of “the body is for the Lord” see Rom. 6:12,13,19; 12:1. On “the Lord is for the body” see Hodge, p. 103; Grosheide, p. 147; RP, p. 124; Morris, p. 100; Barrett, p. 148. Hering, p. 46, sees an allusion to the Eucharist (as he often does!).

verse 14

ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ τὸν κύριον ἤγειρεν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ—ἠγειρεν from ἐγείρω = “wake, raise up, restore” (AG, p. 213). Note the temporal augment ε > η, the “ε” theme vowel and the movable “ν.” Recall that in liquid verbs (HNTG, Paradigm V-4e) the “σ” tense sign drops out. Ἐξεγερεῖ is the same verb with ἐκ-prefix. The circumflex accent is the only signal of the future tense since the “σ” tense sign drops out in liquid verbs. According to A. Oepke, in TDNT, 2,338, “there is no particular significance in the alteration between the simple and compound forms [of ἐγείρω].” To whom does αὐτοῦ refer?

Conzelmann (p. 111) notes a further distinction between stomach and body: the one will be destroyed (vs. 13), the other raised (vs. 14). Barrett says the reason this is so is that body means “whole person” and thus “participates in the continuity of the resurrection life” (p. 148). Gundry (p. 54) rejects the sharp contrast between destruction and resurrection: “The destruction of the stomach and its food need only mean that God ‘will (at the Parousia) cause such a change to take place in the bodily constitution of man and in the world of sense generally, that neither the organs of digestion as such, nor the meats as such, will then be existent’ (cf. 1 Cor. 15:44,51; Mk. 12:25 and parallels). In other words, Paul simply teaches that the physical constitution of the resurrected body will be different from that of the mortal body.” His argument on p. 56 is worth pondering: namely that in Romans 6:6 the word “abolish” (καταργέω) is used to describe what happens to the “body of sin.”

For the connection between Christ’s resurrection and ours see 15:12–19, on which see R. J. Sider, “The Pauline Conception of the Resurrection Body in 1 Corinthians XV.35–54,” *NTS*, 21 (1974–75), 428–39.

verse 15

οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἐστίν;— For οἴδατε see the notes on 5:6. Note the similar rhetorical question in 6:16,19. Μέλη, neut. pl. nom. of μέλος = “member, part, limb” (AG, p. 502). For an

explanation of this unusual-looking ending see HNTG 21.53ff. and the paradigm on p. C-17.

"Members of Christ" anticipates the teaching of 1 Cor. 12: "The underlying thought is that of the body of Christ" (Conzelmann, p. 111). Bultmann (p. 194) argues that the parallel between 1 Cor. 6:15 ("your *bodies* are members of Christ") and 12:27 ("you are the body of Christ and individually members of it") shows that there is no difference in meaning between "you" and "your bodies." Gundry calls this "widely separated" parallel into question with the common sense question: "Does the general statement of Paul concerning the whole person's membership in Christ's Body [12.27] preclude his making a more specific statement elsewhere that a *part* of man's constitution belongs to Christ?" (p. 51). He continues, "In the context of an injunction against sexual immorality Paul serves his purpose better by a pointed reference to man's physique than by a general reference to the totality of man's being" (p. 61). For a bibliography of works on the church and the body of Christ see Ladd, p. 531. For Paul's use of μέλος see J. Horst, in TDNT, 4, 561ff.

ἄρας οὖν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποιήσω πόρνης μέλη; μὴ γένοιτο.— Ἄρας is from αἶρω = "lift up, take up, pick up, take away, remove" (AG, pp. 23f.). Compare ἐκκαθάρατε, 5:7, for the loss of "ι" from the stem. Recall that in liquid verbs the "ο" tense sign drops out and in the nom. sing. participles the "ντ" infix drops ἄρ(σ)α(ντ)ς > ἄρας. Since aor. participles are often part of the action of the main verb we need not translate "having taken the members . . ." but should translate "Shall we take the members of Christ and make . . .?" Alford (p. 517), however, denies that the participle is merely pleonastic. Ποιήσω can be aor. subj. or fut. indic. Which fits the context better? Πόρνη = "prostitute, harlot" (AG, p. 700). "Perhaps we should remember that *pornai*' were in general sacred prostitutes, slaves attached to the service of a pagan temple (notably to a temple of Venus-Aphrodite), who were supposed to put those who worshipped them in communion with the deity they served" (Héring, p. 45). See also F. Hauck-S. Schulz, in TDNT, 6,593. Γένοιτο is aor. mid. opt. 3rd sing. of γίνομαι—so common you should simply memorize this form.

Note the shift in imagery (Barrett, p. 148): in vs. 15a our body is a member of Christ; in v. 15b our members seem to be in view since we take them and make them members of a harlot. What is the basis of Paul's emphatic No to fornication? "By such a union the Christian would form one body with the person concerned, and it is impossible to belong at the same time to two bodies" (Héring, p. 46, see next verse). Héring's observation raises the question why a legitimate marriage union would not be excluded for the same reason. For Bruce's answer see p. 64 on vs. 15; for Gundry's see pp. 53f.

In the flow of Paul's argument v. 15 marks a new beginning, since in 15–20 the matter of destruction and/or resurrection of the body is left behind. Verse 15a can be seen as the fulcrum between the two arguments supporting what preceded (vs. 14—our resurrection based on Christ's) and what follows (the implications of union with Christ now).

verse 16

ὁ κολλώμενος τῇ πόρνη ἐν σῶμά ἐστιν;—Κολλώμενος from κολλάω = “join closely together, unite” (AG, p. 442); contract verb α + ο > ω. May be middle (“join oneself to”) or passive (“is joined to”). Do not confuse ἐν with ἐν.

Ἔσονται γάρ, φησίν, οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.—Ἔσονται is fut. of εἶμι. Φησίν from φημί = “say, affirm” (AG, p. 864). On the μι-verbs see HNTG Paradigm V-7a. Μία is the feminine form of εἷς.

Paul quotes Gen. 2:24 from the LXX. The Hebrew reads, *w^ehāyū l^ebāsār 'ehād* (cf. Gen. 2:7,10). The LXX reads, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. This is a good illustration of how Hebrew influenced Hellenistic Greek. *w^ehāyū l^e* (“is unto”) means “become.” This construction is very literally taken over into Greek as ἔσονται εἰς (“they shall be to”) = they become.

The use of body (vs. 15a) and flesh (vs. 15b) would suggest that Paul sees no distinction here, even though “flesh” is usually a negative term for him (RP, p. 127). But Barrett (p. 149) thinks that even here Paul intends “flesh” to be evil: “If one places his body at the disposal of a harlot, and so becomes one body with her, the body has taken the wrong turning, and becomes flesh.” Gundry (p. 62) rejects Barrett's view and sees the parallel between flesh and body as a strong support for his thesis that “body” does not mean whole person. Conzelmann (p. 111n28) points out that the oneness of flesh spoken of in Gen. 2:24 is not true only of married partners but “simply describes sexual union in general.” Precisely here lies the force of Paul's argument.

verse 17

ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν πνευμά ἐστιν.—Κολλάω takes dat., since it means “to join to something.”

Conzelmann (p. 112) thinks that this simply restates and explains vs. 15 that our bodies are members of Christ. Gundry cites others who hold this view (p. 65n1) but argues that Paul presents not one truth but two: “the twin truths add up to this: the whole man, body and spirit, belongs to the Lord. . . . Paul opposes the disparity between carnal union with a harlot and spiritual union with the Lord because although body and spirit differ, they belong together in the service of Christ” (p. 69). Other texts that may shed light on the spiritual union

of the believer and Christ are Rom. 8:9-27; 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 4:6; John 15:1-7; 17:21,23. On the theology of being "in Christ" or "in the Spirit" see Ladd, pp. 479-94 (bibliography, p. 479).

verse 18

φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν.—Φεύγω = "flee, escape, shun" (AG, p. 863). Is it present or imperative? Cf. 10:14. This is a repetition explicitly of what was demanded implicitly in vs. 15*b*. It is a specific instance of how one fulfils the command of 6:20 to glorify God in the body. Bruce (p. 65) sees an echo of Joseph's literal fleeing a temptation of this kind (Gen. 39:12).

πᾶν ἁμάρτημα ὃ ἐὰν ποιήσῃ ἄνθρωπος ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος ἐστίν. ὃ δὲ πορνείων εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἁμαρτάνει.—Ἅμάρτημα = "sin, transgression" (AG, p. 42). Do not confuse the relative pronoun ὃ with the definite article ὁ. Ἐάν is a compound of εἰ and ἄν; its use "is all of a piece with the use of ἄν in senses corresponding with the English indefinite suffix—"ever" in *whoever, whenever*, etc. There is a conditional clause latent in such words" (Moule, p. 151). What mood regularly follows ἐάν? Ἐκτός = "outside" (AG, p. 245). Πορνεύω = "to prostitute, to practice sexual immorality" (AG, p. 700); do not confuse the nom. pres. participle with the gen. πορνευόντων; the genitive always has the -ντ-; the nominative never does. Εἰς in this context can mean "against" as in Luke 15:8 (AG, p. 228,4 *ca*), but the contrast with ἐκτός suggests that εἰς also has a spatial significance.

Verses 16 and 17 ground both 15*b* and 18*a* (which say essentially the same thing). Now in 18*b* another argument commences in support of 18*a*. How can one explain this strange argument that all sins are outside the body except fornication? After all, sins like gluttony, drunkenness, and suicide *do* strike the body (Héring, p. 46). Several suggestions have been made:

1. Paul is only speaking comparatively. Calvin (p. 131): "My explanation is that he does not completely deny that there are other sins, which also bring dishonour and disgrace upon our bodies, but that he is simply saying that those other sins do not leave *anything like the same* filthy stain on our bodies as fornication does" (ital. added). So also Barrett, p. 151.

2. Moule (pp. 196f.) thinks that vs. 18*a* is a Corinthian libertine slogan ("all sins are outside the body") and 18*b* is Paul's retort. See Barrett's (p. 150) and Gundry's (p. 73) criticisms.

3. E. Schweizer (TDNT, 7,1070) construes "body" in 18*b* as the body of Christ, the church. "In the community man is represented as united with Christ in such bodily fashion that all other sins are more readily conceivable than fornication, which accomplishes bodily union with someone else and therefore cannot take place within the body of Christ, the two being mutually exclusive." See Gundry's reply (p. 73).

4. R. Kempthorne, "Incest and the Body of Christ: A Study of

I Corinthians 6:12-20," in *NTS*, 14 (1968), 568-74, offers a combination of Moule's and Schweizer's views. Verse 18a harks back to the incident of incest in 5:1-5 and represents the Corinthian claim that the sin of incest lay outside the ecclesiastical body because the step-mother was not a Christian. Paul retorts that the man sins against the church because the church is *his* (the man's) body by virtue of his membership in it. See Gundry's critique (pp. 75-79).

5. Gundry (p. 72) says Alford's is the "best interpretation": "The assertion, which has surprised many of the Commentators, is nevertheless *strictly true*. Drunkenness and gluttony, e.g., are sins done *in* and *by* the body, and are sins *by abuse of* the body,—but they are still ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος—introduced *from without*, sinful *not* in their *act*, but in their *effect*, which effect it is each man's duty to foresee and avoid. But fornication is *alienating that body which is the Lord's, and making it a harlot's body*—it is sin *against a man's own body*, in its very nature,—against *the verity and nature* of his body; not an *effect* on the body from participation of things without, but a *contradiction of the truth* of the body, wrought *within itself*" (p. 518). See too J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Corinthian Slogans in 1 Cor. 6,12-20," *CBQ*, 40 (1978), 391-96; B. Byrne, "Sinning against One's Own Body: Paul's Understanding of the Sexual Relationship in 1 Corinthians 6:18," *CBQ*, 45 (1983), 608-16.

verse 19

τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐστίν—Ναός = "temple" (AG, p. 535; cf. O. Michel, in *TDNT*, 4,880ff.). Bruce (p. 65): "Cf. 3.16, where the statement that the community is a temple of God is similarly introduced; but here the reference is to the individual believer's body as the sanctuary of the indwelling Spirit" (similarly Barrett, p. 151). Against this view Kempthorne ("Incest," pp. 572f.; see above on 6:18 #4) maintains that the singular *sōma* in vv. 19 and 20 refers to the Body of Christ. Similarly P. S. Minear, *Images of the Church in the New Testament* (1960), pp. 180-82. Gundry argues against this view on pp. 76f. and refers to 2 Cor. 4:10 and Rom. 8:23, where the singular *sōma* is used distributively.

Héring (p. 47) keenly notes the attributive position of the phrase ἐν ὑμῖν and sees it as qualifying the degree to which the Holy Spirit dwells in us: "Here it is the body of the individual which is to become the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit—not in His fullness, but in the measure in which He can reside there. (Hence we read ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος and not simply ναὸς ἁγίου πνεύματος.) The ideal will only be made visibly real in the future aeon, that is, in the resurrection world."

οὐ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ—Why is the relative pronoun οὗ in the gen. when it is functioning as the dir. obj. of ἔχετε (HNTG §35.573)? Compare 1 Thess. 4:8 on the gift of the Spirit as a motive for chastity.

verses 19b,20

καὶ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐαυτῶν; ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς.—ἠγοράσθητε from ἀγοράζω = “buy, purchase” (AG, p. 12; F. Büchsel, in TDNT, 1,125). For the morphology see on ἐξουσιασθήσομαι at 6:12 above. Here there is a temporal augment and a -θη- infix. Τιμῆς is a genitive of price. Remember that punctuation is editorial not original; should the question mark (;) come after ἐαυτῶν or after the earlier θεοῦ? See the BSGNT apparatus.

A parallel is 7:23. Only in these two texts does Paul use the term ἀγοράζω in relation to Christians. “The fundamental idea of ransoming Paul derived from the Old Testament where the words are used in a wide variety of senses (e.g., Ex. 6:6; 13:13; Ruth 4:4ff.; Ps. 103:4; Is. 43:1)” (Barrett, p. 152). See the excursus in Conzelmann (p. 131) on the ransoming of slaves in that day. “In Rom. 3:24f.; Eph. 1:7 the redemption (there *apolytrōsis*) is procured through the blood of Christ (cf. Ac. 20:28; Heb. 9:12; 1 Pet. 1:18f.; Rev. 5:9), and this doubtless is the price (*timē*) here” (Bruce, p. 65).

Verses 19b and 20 seem to be a ground alongside 19a (“your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit”) for 18b (“the fornicator sins against his own body”) and 20b (“glorify God in your body”).

δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν.—Δοξάσατε from δοξάζω = “praise, honor, magnify, glorify” (AG, p. 203; cf. G. Kittel, in TDNT, 2,253). The σα- infix without an augment means the word is what mood and tense? Δῆ with exhortations or commands gives them greater urgency = “now, then, therefore” (AG, p. 177).

From the context, how does one bring glory to God with the body (cf., e.g., vs. 15, also 10:31)? Note the textual variants at the end of 6:20 in the BSGNT apparatus. Metzger (p. 553) maintains that the words “and in your spirits which are God’s” (in KJV) “are a gloss with no claim to be original.” This is clear “(a) from the decisive testimony of the earliest and best witnesses in support of the shorter text . . . and (b) from the nature of the addition itself (it is not needed for the argument, which relates to the sanctity of the body, with no mention of the spirit [sic v. 17]). The words were inserted apparently with a desire to soften Paul’s abruptness, and to extend the range of his exhortation.”

THE STRUCTURE OF THE ARGUMENT

The argument in these verses is complex and does not flow neatly from premises to conclusion. In verses 15–20 there is a four-pillar foundation of the argument, each pillar of which relates to union with Christ/Spirit: vs. 15a: “your bodies are members of Christ”; vs. 17: “the one united to the Lord is one spirit with him”; vs. 19a: “your body is the temple of the

Holy Spirit"; and vv. 19b, 20: "you are not yours but God's since he bought you." Upon these four pillars rests the threefold hortatory conclusion in vs. 15b: "do not make the members of Christ the members of a prostitute!"; vs. 18a: "flee fornication!"; and vs. 20b: "glorify God in your body!"

In verses 12-14 Paul moves into the subject of fornication through the door of two Corinthian slogans (vv. 12 and 13) which attempt to justify license in one's use of the body (in eating [vs. 13a] and in sexuality [vs. 13b]). Paul's initial response is fourfold: vs. 12a: one should use one's freedom only to do what is beneficial (i.e., what builds up the faith and love of the church); vs. 12b: one should beware of falling into slavery to passions in the name of liberty; vs. 13b: the body does *not* exist merely to be gratified sexually, it exists for the Lord and the Lord is concerned with it (this anticipates the four pillars of vv. 15-20); vs. 14: the body is not merely transient and so ethically negligible; it is destined to be raised (and glorified, Rom. 8:21,23).

J. Héring (p. 47) makes a perceptive summarizing statement:

We are probably witnessing here [in 1 Cor. 6] the first attempt in the history of moral thought to refute libertinism in some other way than by the arguments of an ascetic, legalistic or utilitarian type which are so common in Greek philosophy.