Electronic Thesis & Dissertation Collection

J. Oliver Buswell Jr. Library
12330 Conway Road
Saint Louis, MO 63141

www.covenantseminary.edu/library

"Do You Not Know You Are God's Temple?" 1 Corinthians 3:9-17 and Paul's Relational Anthropology

By

J. Hunter Quinn

A Project Submitted to
the Faculty of Covenant Theological Seminary
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Theology.

Saint Louis, Missouri

2022

"Do You Not Know You Are God's Temple?" 1 Corinthians 3:9-17 and Paul's Relational Anthropology

By
J. Hunter Quinn

A Project Submitted to
the Faculty of Covenant Theological Seminary
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Theology.

Graduation Date   January 13, 2023

Dr. Robbie Griggs
Faculty Advisor

Dr. Dan Doriani
Second Reader

Dr. Robbie Griggs
Director of ThM Program

Mr. Steve Jamieson
Library Director

Abstract

This thesis analyzes in three parts the temple metaphor of 1 Cor. 3:9-17 for Paul's theology of relationships and, by extension, his relational anthropology. It makes use of the pneumatology of Volker Rabens and the anthropology of Mary Douglas in order to demonstrate how this metaphor encapsulates the Pauline relational self and by extension its import for Paul's view of union with Christ. I argue that the temple metaphor of 1 Corinthians depicts the self as constituted in and through relationships.

In the first part of this thesis, I discuss the composition of the metaphor and the temple referents. I argue that the theme of Christian growth in Christlike unites 3:9-17 into a single temple metaphor. Given similarities in language and imagery, I argue that referent for the temple in 3:9-17 must be the Jerusalem temple. Further, I find that persons make up the entirety of this metaphorical temple. This part brings clarity to the metaphor prior to my application of Rabens and Douglas.

In the second part of this thesis, I use Rabens' pneumatology to argue that Paul's relational anthropology as depicted in the metaphor preserves the self as a discreet entity while also showing how the self is constituted in and through relationships. I connect the temple metaphor with earlier passages in 1 Corinthians to show that the self-in-community is God's act of new creation in Christ, mediated relationally by God's Spirit in a way which binds the community together in temple-like unity. I analyze the interplay between divine grace and human agency in the metaphor to conclude that the self is initiated into Christlike growth by God alone and consummated by Christ alone at the eschaton, a process in which the community plays a significant role. I conclude that the enduring eschatological shape of the self is in some sense relationally-determined.

In third part if this thesis, I employ Douglas' structuralist methodology to show how the motif of temple holiness structures the embodied self in Christocentric relationships. I employ the Douglas categories of restricted code to interpret the cultural sense of temples, rituals, ritual purity, and the presence of the divine. I argue that Paul's temple symbolism embeds the self in a matrix vertical and horizontal relationships within an eschatologically-oriented social order. The relational intensity of this order demands moral purity in order to preserve the moral shape of the self and the community. In light of this imagery, I suggest that the notion of an embodied Christian *habitus* best reflects Paul's anthropology in 1 Corinthians. Moreover, the concept of *habitus* explains how one who labors on the metaphorical temple according to the spirit of the world can harm the social order of the eschatological community, while one who labors on the structure according to the mind of Christ further inculcates Christ in others.

To Twin Oaks Presbyterian Church, for modeling what it means to be the temple of God,

and to my parents, for their years of love and support,

and to my wife Laura, whose sacrifice and encouragement lies behind each page of this thesis.

Contents

Abbreviations

BDAG   Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

CGRN   Carbon, J.-M., S. Peels, and V. Pirenne-Delforge. *Collection of Greek Ritual Norms (CGRN).* Liège, 2017-. Accessed July 13, 2022. http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be.

LSJ   Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1996.

Introduction

The Corinthian correspondence offers us modern readers a privileged look into how Paul addresses an ancient problem which continues to plague churches today: conflict which arises within communal relationships. Compared to Paul's other epistles, 1 Corinthians stands out in the way it depicts community division and troubled relationships. The fraught relational bonds in Corinth result in a dire ethical situation (or, perhaps, ethical conflict resulting from improper relationships): incest, lawsuits, prostitution, misuse of the Lord's Supper, etc. Paul enters into this situation with practical theological counsel aimed at unifying the congregation. As such, 1 Corinthians represents Paul's attempts at overcoming community division (1 Cor. 1:10). This epistle not only illustrates his understanding of ethics within the church but also the theological reasoning behind his ethical conclusions. Because Paul's theological reasoning shapes his attempt at healing broken relationships within the Corinthian community, 1 Corinthians gives us a window into his theology of relationships.

Because Paul's temple metaphor is a regularly-occurring rhetorical image in the Corinthian correspondence (occurring in 1 Cor. 3:16-17, 6:19; 2 Cor. 7:16-18), I will be examining how this metaphor connects to the relationality which characterizes Paul's theology. Compared to the Corinthian correspondence, the temple metaphor does not appear with such rhetorical emphasis or intensity in the other Pauline letters. I will explore in this thesis how the occurrences of the Corinthian temple metaphor are closely tied to the relational-ethical situation in Corinth. When we pay attention to the context of each temple metaphor within the Corinthian epistles, we notice that Paul is highlighting something about the relational nature of the Christian life. The temple metaphor captures

a particular aspect of relationships in each passage: communal relationships (1 Cor. 3:16-17), the individual's relationship to one's own body and to sexual partners (1 Cor. 6:19), and the interplay of marital relationships and broader community relationships (2 Cor. 7:16-18). Moreover, God's presence with the community and the individual is at the heart of each temple metaphor. Just as Paul captures something of Christian relationships with this image, he also addresses specific ethical challenges in each instance: failure to build up the community with the wisdom of the cross (1 Cor. 3:16-17), sex with prostitutes (1 Cor. 6:19), and marriage to unbelievers (2 Cor. 7:16-18). When we read the temple metaphor in the Corinthian correspondence as a whole, it appears that something about the symbolism of the temple appropriately addressed the nature of relationships and ethics. Therefore, a close study of the temple metaphor in 1 Corinthians may offer us insight into Paul's theology of relationships.

In this thesis, I will be arguing that the temple metaphor as it appears in the context of 3:1-17 reveals Paul's relational anthropology; in other words, Paul understands that the embodied Christian self is constituted through relationships with God and others by being embedded in an eschatological social order. Among all the options presented by scholars for interpreting the temple metaphor (explored below), I will suggest that the best interpretation is to understand it as a relational symbol reflective of Paul's anthropology. In order to make this claim, I will first clarify the composition of the metaphorical temple. I will demonstrate that (1) in 3:13-15 ἔργον refers to the people of the Corinthian congregation, that (2) the building materials of 3:12 refer to the quality of the builder's workmanship, and (3) that the foundation of 3:10-11 refers to Christ. This will enable me to make my first main point: the metaphorical temple is composed entirely

of persons. An analysis of Paul's depiction of divine and human agency in building the temple structure will further indicate that Christian eschatologically-oriented self exists on a spectrum between the chaos of sin on one hand and maturity in Christ on the other. I will then make my second main point: where the self sits on this dynamic spectrum depends on divine and human relationships, until Christ alone brings about the eschatological fulfillment of both the temple and the Christian self at the Parousia. For my third main point, I will argue that the notion of an embodied Christian *habitus* embedded in an eschatological social order best describes the self as depicted by Paul in the metaphorical picture of 1 Cor. 3:9-17. Therefore, the temple metaphor symbolizes the need for both individual and communal holiness precisely because Paul understands the Christian self as relationally-constituted.

The Need for this Study

While there is broad recognition in scholarship that the temple motif is closely related to both the Pauline notion of union with Christ[1] and to his theological anthropology,[2] comprehensive anthropological treatments of the temple metaphor in 3:9-17 are generally lacking. Older treatments of Paul's anthropology engage the temple

---

[1] Hans Burger, *Being in Christ: A Biblical and Systematic Investigation in a Reformed Perspective*, (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2009), 237-239; Constantine R. Campbell, *Paul and Union with Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2012), 267-324; Grant Macaskill, *Union with Christ in the New Testament* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2013), 154-155.

[2] Hannah K. Harrington, *The Purity and Sanctuary of the Body in Second Temple Judaism*, (Göttingen, DE: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019), *passim*; Annette Weissenrieder, "'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*, eds. David L Balch and Annette Weissenrieder (Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 377-411.

metaphor of 1 Cor. 6:19 but not 3:9-17.[3] However, as scholars have grown to appreciate the centrality of relationships for Paul and have subjected this aspect of his thought to greater study, there has been a corresponding appreciation for relationality in Paul's anthropology.[4] Because this shift towards relationality in Paul has impacted anthropological interpretations of 1 Cor. 6:19, Dunn's treatment of 1 Cor. 3:9-17 (or more often 3:16-17) draw comparisons to 6:19 without giving full expression to the nature of the connection between the two verses.[5] At the same time, Wright places such a heavy emphasis upon the Temple-replacement theology of 3:16-17 that this replacement theology overrides the theological anthropology of 6:19.[6] In light of this state of scholarly

---

[3] Cf. Robert H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 135-156, 220, 232-238; Ernst Käsemann, "On Paul's Anthropology," in *Perspectives on Paul*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Mifflingtown, PA: Sigler, 1996), 1-31; Robert Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 1971), 284-288.

[4] Cf. James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 51-78; Susan Grove Eastman, *Paul and the Person: Reframing Paul's Anthropology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2017), *passim*; Stanley J. Grenz, *The Social God and the Relational Self: A Trinitarian Theology of the* Imago Dei (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox: 2001), 205-264; Udo Schnelle, *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005), 494-545.

[5] Dunn writes on the temple image, "[Christian] bodies are themselves temples enshrining God's presence." In the footnote, he cites both 1 Cor. 3:16-17 and 1 Cor. 6:19 (Dunn, 330). He does this later while discussing baptism: "[Believers'] bodies were now the only temple of which they need take account," again citing both 1 Cor. 3:16-17 and 1 Cor. 6:19 (Dunn, 454). However, he later presents 3:16-17 as referring to the community and 6:19 as referring to the individual believer, which reflects his distinction between the related ideas of the body corporate and the body corporeal (Dunn, 55-61, 545). Cf. Douglas A. Campbell, *Pauline Dogmatics: The Triumph of God's Love* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2020), 528-530; Harrington, 325-332.

[6] N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2013), 2.712-713. Of 1 Cor. 3:16-17 he writes, "Unless Paul is totally deceived, the divine spirit has taken up residence in the fellowship of Corinthian believers. The church as it stands, is thus already the new Temple, and the spirit that dwells within is the new Shekinah" (Wright, 2.712). A few sentences later Wright writes, "It is one thing for 'the church' as a whole to be designated as the new Temple, and for the indwelling spirit to take the role of the Shekinah with it. But it is always possible (and we see this possibility at various points in 1 Corinthians) for particular Christians within the church to be happy with a general truth but not to apply it to themselves. Paul will have none of it. What is true of the church as a whole is true of every sing Christian. To sin against the body is to deface the divine Temple, to ignore the Shekinah who, in shocking fulfillment of ancient promises, has returned to dwell in that Temple at last" (Wright, 2.712-713). Does this mean that the body of each individual Christian is the eschatological fulfillment of the Jerusalem temple?

affairs, there is need for a detailed study of the temple metaphor in 3:9-17 with an eye

toward Paul's anthropology. Not only would this perhaps clarify Paul's anthropology, but

it might also give us a greater appreciation for Paul's view of the Christian's union with

Christ. The temple metaphor in 3:16-17 is cited as one of the four main images which

Paul offers to his readers for understanding their union with Christ.[7] However, scholars

allot significantly less space to this particular metaphor (especially the metaphor in 1 Cor.

3:16-17) in comparison to the other three images.[8] A closer analysis of 1 Cor. 3:9-17 will

provide insight into Paul's relational anthropology in such a way as to deepen our own

appreciation for the Pauline theme of union with Christ.

Methodology

In order to draw out the implications of temple symbolism in 1 Cor. 3:16-17, I

will be drawing upon Volker Rabens' study on the connection between Paul's

pneumatology and his ethics. Rabens challenges the idea that ethical transformation of

the individual comes about through the infusion of a substantive πνεῦμα.[9] Instead, he

---

Wright is unclear, and his further references to these two passages throughout his book do not provide further clarity.

[7] Burger, 237-239; Campbell, 267-324.

[8] For example, Burger gives thirteen pages to the image of a body, three and a half pages to the image of marriage, three pages to the image of clothing, and two pages to the image of the temple (Burger, 223-245). Constantine gives twenty-one pages to the image of the body, thirteen pages to the image of marriage, twelve and a half pages to clothing, and nine and a half pages to the temple (Constantine, 367-324). Cf. Macaskill, 154-155. Macaskill gives much greater space to analyzing the image of the temple in connection to the doctrine of the believer's union with Christ, but his analysis of 1 Cor. 3:16-17 is only slightly longer than the length of a page (Macaskill, 154-155). While the unequal space allotted to the different images certainly reflect something of Paul's own emphasis, it could also be that there is more fruitful work which may be done regarding the temple image (especially considering the symbolically-charged nature of this image in the ancient Mediterranean world).

[9] Volker Rabens, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life*, 2nd rev. ed., (Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 25-120. Rabens notes that pneumatological models based on the infusion-transformation approach are based on appeals to parallels in Paul's

suggests a dynamic relational model for ethical empowerment. In this model, the believer is ethically transformed by his or her "Spirit-created relationship to θεός (ἀββα ὁ πατήρ), Χριστός, and fellow believers."[10] Rabens describes the Spirit's relational work as "creating deeper understanding of, encounter with and beholding of [the glory of] the Lord."[11] Through these Spirit-constituted relationships, the believer is empowered for ethical life. As I noted above, Paul's temple metaphor appears in the contexts of relationships and ethics. Rabens himself does not specifically apply his model to the exegesis of 1 Cor. 3:1-17, so I will take up this task. I believe that Rabens model will give us greater insight into Paul's use of temple symbolism and how it is based on a relational model of the Christian self.

I will also be drawing upon Rabens' work with regards to metaphor theory. In the development of his own model for Paul's pneumatology and ethics, Rabens also developed a systematic framework to be used for interpreting a metaphor. Drawing on linguistic criticism and the philosophy of language, he recommends identifying three "contexts" for a particular metaphor: the context of the utterance, the context of the culture, and the context of the reference.[12] The context of the utterance describes the physical space of the communication, the medium of communication, and the

---

surrounding context. He argues that such appeals are ill founded. He demonstrates that Hellenistic sources were familiar with a physical πνεῦμα but did not understand it as capable for transformation through infusion (35). Likewise, Hellenistic Jewish sources (including Philo) did not understand the πνεῦμα as such (78-79).

[10] Ibid, 129.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Rabens, 47-50.

relationship of the participants to one another.[13] The context of the culture focuses on

understanding how people understand a specific metaphor.[14] Finally, the context of the

reference refers to the subject-matter of the text.[15] My thesis will specifically address the

context of the culture and the context of the reference in order to both elucidate the

metaphor and understand the relational theology it describes.

Because few scholars have employed Mary Douglas' anthropological insights

when exegeting 1 Cor. 3:9-17,[16] I will also be employing Mary Douglas' anthropological

insights to Paul's argument in two ways. First, I will be drawing upon her influential

work *Purity and Danger*. While she herself adjusted parts of her argument in response to

criticism, her central thesis remains unchanged and continues to shape the studies of

ritual purity specialists.[17] Douglas understood purity and pollution as indicative of a

larger interconnected system replete with social symbols.[18] Her structuralist approach to

ritual impurity sees defilement as only making sense within a broad structure of

mutually-reinforcing ideas; to isolate one aspect of this system renders the rest of it

---

[13] Ibid, 47.

[14] Ibid, 48.

[15] Ibid, 49.

[16] See Michael K. W. Suh, *Power and Peril: Paul's Use of Temple Discourse in 1 Corinthians* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020), 16.

[17] Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000), 7-10; 18-19. For recent challenges to Douglas' belief with respect to Jewish purity studies, see Will Rogan, "Purity in Early Judaism: Current Issues and Questions," *Currents in Biblical Research* 16, no. 3 (2018): 309-339. Cf. Jack J. Lennon, *Pollution and Religion in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 8-9.

[18] Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 2nd rev. ed. (London: Routledge, 2002), 51.

incomprehensible.[19] Moreover, she sees ritual purity systems as reflecting society's order

and enforcing that order upon the body of society's individual members.[20] If a particular

society understood its own order as divinely-inspired, then it likewise understood its

ritual purity system as both teaching and enforcing the will of the divine. In light of

Douglas' structuralist insights, I will attempt to read Paul's metaphorical temple as one

part of a broader system. This will be made possible by my second use of Douglas'

conclusions. In her work *Natural Symbols*, Douglas shows how societies use symbols to

express both meaning and exert control upon individuals.[21] She classes societies into two

types of linguistic categories: elaborated code and restricted code. Elaborated code is

flexible, while restricted code "is deeply enmeshed in the immediate social structure,

utterances have double purpose: they convey information, yes, but they also express the

social structure, embellish and reinforce it."[22] This type of communication flourishes in a

highly-structured, hierarchical group or society (what she calls "grid strong" groups).[23]

Douglas defines ritual as one such restricted code that is capable of transmitting

condensed cosmological ideas.[24] In light of these conclusions, I will treat Paul's temple

metaphor as an example of restricted code and attempt to draw out the implicit

cosmological ideas. As I will demonstrate, the two approaches mentioned above are

---

[19] Ibid, 51.

[20] Ibid, 158-159

[21] Mary Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, 2nd rev. ed. (London: Routledge Classics, 2003), 22-23.

[22] Ibid, 25.

[23] Ibid, 31.

[24] Ibid, 82.

justified considering the "grid strong" groups of the ancient Mediterranean world and the symbolism of the temple within its writings.

Chapter 1: The Context of the Referents in the Temple Metaphor

Chapter Summary

What is the structure of Paul's metaphor and what are the referents? These are my guiding questions in this section. In order to analyze how Paul's temple metaphor reflects his relational anthropology, I will provide in this chapter my exegesis of 3:1-17 and argue that Paul's temple metaphor begins in 3:9 and ends in 3:17. Subsequently, I will provide my justification for using Douglas' and Rabens' respective theoretical models in my analysis of the temple metaphor. This will enable me to use their models in chapters two and three, where I will show how Paul's relational anthropology is central to his temple metaphor.

The State of Scholarship: Entering the Discussion

Because the scholarship on Paul's temple metaphor in 1 Cor. 3 varies significantly, with nearly each scholar taking different positions on (1) where it begins, (2) where it ends, (3) its internal consistency, and (4) its referents, I will attempt to bring clarity to the metaphor on these four points. While all agree that Paul is speaking metaphorically in 3:9-17, there are many different interpretations concerning the Pauline images of the community as a field, the community as a building, and the community as a temple. First, there are three general positions regarding the relationship between the building metaphor and the temple metaphor. In the first major point of disagreement, a small selection of scholars understand Paul's temple metaphor as merely limited to 3:16-

17 and unconnected to the building section in 3:10-15.[25] Kuck is representative of this

group. He understands the οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ("do you not know") clause of v. 16 as

signaling a distinct rhetorical unit. In Kuck's view, the verbal idea of "building up" in vv.

10-15 expands upon the notion spiritual edification in v. 8 separate from the temple

building of vv. 16-17.[26] A second group sees the temple metaphor as contained to 3:16-17

even if it develops logically from the previous metaphorical structure.[27] Garland is

representative of this group when he writes that Paul employees three distinct metaphors

(field, undefined building, and the temple) to describe communal unity and holiness.

While these three images work together to describe church life and elevate the level of

holiness and unity expected of the church, they are nevertheless distinct.[28] Finally, the

third group posits that 3:16-17 acts as a rhetorical climax in which Paul reveals that the

structure of 3:10-15 is God's temple.[29] Lanci represents this position when he argues that

---

[25] Mark Bonnington, "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*, eds. T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 2004), 155-156; Christfried Böttrich. "'Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes': Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, eds. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer (Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 411-423; Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, trans. James W. Leitch, ed. George W. MacRae with James W. Dunkly, Hermeneia (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1975), 77-78; David W. Kuck, *Judgment and Community Conflict: Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5 - 4:5* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 1992), 186; Wolfram Strack, *Kultische Terminologie in ekklesiologischen Kontexten in den Briefen des Paulus* (Weinheim, DE: Beltz Athenäum, 1994), 230.

[26] Kuck, 184-187.

[27] C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Black's New Testament Commentary (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1968), 90; Gordon F. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians,* rev. ed., New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014), 157-158; David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003), 119-120; Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians*, Interpretation (Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1997), 56; Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, Abingdon (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1998), 66; Yulin Liu, *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians* (Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 114-121.

[28] Garland, 117-120.

[29] Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 158-159; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians,* Sacra

the οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι clause of v. 16 serves two functions. Within vv. 9-17, the clause

signals the rhetorical climax of the passage, in which the building project of vv. 10-15 is

revealed as the temple building of vv. 16-17. Moreover, according to Lanci, Paul uses the

οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι to indicate both a theme and an image to which he will return later in the

epistle.[30] While the relationship between the building metaphor and the temple metaphor

is the first major point of contention within this passage, the second point of

disagreement centers on the consistency of Paul's building metaphor. Conzelmann argues

that Paul mixes his metaphors and clouds his meaning.[31] Others see such complete

consistency in Paul's metaphors that they understand all the referents as interrelated and

open to a single, overreaching interpretation.[32] For Beale, Paul is writing as a theologian

of the Old Testament who draws upon three different Old Testament depictions of God's

dwelling: the garden of Eden, the Tabernacle, and the Jerusalem temple. As such, the

---

Pagina, ed. Daniel J. Harrington (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 148; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Yale Bible (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 202-203; Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 56-57; Albert L. A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence* (Leuven, BE: Peeters, 2006), 311-314; Alexander N. Kirk, "Building with the Corinthians: Human Persons as the Building Materials of 1 Corinthians 3.12 and the 'Work' of 3.13-15," *New Testament Studies* 58, no. 4 (Oct. 2012): 556; John R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Strategy* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 119-120; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 315-317; Weissenrieder, "'Do You Not Know That You Are God's Temple?," 408-411.

[30] Lanci, 108-120.

[31] Conzelmann, 75-77. Conzelmann apparently thinks this point is obvious, because he does not elaborate on this claim.

[32] Cf. G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2004), 245-253; Jay Shanor, "Paul as Master Builder: Construction Terms in 1 Corinthians," *New Testament Studies* 34, no. 3 (1988): 461-471.

three metaphors cohere in 1 Cor. 3:9-17.[33] For Shanor, Paul is writing as a missiologist who draws upon images familiar to his Gentile audience: sacred fields and pagan temples.[34] Other scholars, acknowledging varying degrees of both consistency and metaphor mixing in the pericope, occupy a middle ground between these two positions.[35] In the third major area of disagreement, researchers debate the referent to Paul's metaphorical temple. Some authors think Paul is using general temple imagery to make his point.[36] As a representative of this perspective, Thiselton argues that Paul is circumspect regarding the identity of this temple, and we run the risk of eisegesis if we try to locate the referent of Paul's temple.[37] Others believe that Paul has an eschatological temple in view and is spiritualizing the concept.[38] Barrett represents this perspective when he correlates the presence of the Holy Spirit within the Corinthian community with both the *Shekinah* cloud in Solomon's temple and God's presence in the heavenly temple. Thus, the Christian community is for Paul both the fulfillment of the Old Testament type and the fulfillment of the heavenly temple.[39] Still others understand the referent to be the

---

[33] Beale, 245-253/

[34] Shanor, "Paul as Master Builder," 461-471.

[35] Cf. Böttrich, 411-423; Fee,149-150.

[36] Böttrich, 411-423; Fee, 158-160; Garland, 116-121; Lanci, 5; Shanor, 461-471; Strack, 233-234; Thiselton, 310-316; Weissenrieder, 400-408. Horsley may place himself in this category, but he is not clear on this (Horsley, 66).

[37] Thiselton, 310-316.

[38] Barrett, 90-91; Conzelmann, 76; Gärtner, 56-60; Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 53-61.

[39] Barrett, 90-91.

Jerusalem temple.[40] According to Beale, Paul uses imagery that are drawn from Old

Testament depictions of God's earthly presence amidst his covenant people.[41] Barton

goes a step further. Since the Jerusalem temple was the latest incarnation of this presence,

Paul equates the Christian community to both the textual temple of the Old Testament

and the physical temple in Jerusalem.[42] The current state of scholarship regarding the

form of Paul's temple metaphor exists along these general lines, and I will be engaging

each of the major points of debate in order to clarify the use of Paul's temple metaphor

and how it reflects his relational anthropology.

The Plan for This Chapter

In the first section of this chapter, my primary purpose will be to clarify the

context of the metaphorical referent in order to propose that a discussion of Paul's

relational anthropology within the temple metaphor must include 3:9-15 rather than being

restricted to 3:16-17. I will do this in two ways. First, I will examine the central theme of

3:9-17, namely that of Christian growth. Because growth presupposes a mature state (or a

telos), I will suggest that the reference to God's temple in vv. 16-17 is the maturation of

the building project in vv. 9-15. With regards to the scholarly disagreement regarding the

structure of Paul's metaphor, my argument will align with those who like Lanci argue

that 3:16-17 is the rhetorical climax to 3:10-15, in which Paul reveals the identity of his

---

[40] Stephen C. Barton, "Why Do Things Move People?: The Jerusalem Temple as Emotional Repository," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 37, no. 4 (2015): 374; Beale, 461-471; Ciampa and Rosner, 158-159; Collins, 153; Fitzmyer, 202-203; Hogeterp, 311-314; Hays, 57; Kuck, 177; Liu, 121; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *1 Corinthians*, Doubleday Bible Commentary (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 25.

[41] Beale, 461-471.

[42] Barton, "Jerusalem Temple," 374.

metaphorical building. Second, I will establish the identity of this temple as the Jerusalem temple. Paul uses language which echoes that of the Old Testament passages which describe the construction of the Mosaic tabernacle and the Solomonic temple. As such, I will argue that Paul is referring to the Jerusalem temple with respect to God's presence in the sanctuary. While Paul's direct point of comparison is the holiness of the temple, it is the divine indwelling which makes a temple by sanctifying it, thereby setting it apart from profane buildings. In the same manner, the Corinthian congregation is holy precisely because God dwells in their midst. This makes the temple metaphor apt for the Corinthians. Within the debate regarding the identity of Paul's temple, my argument will follow closely to those put forth by Barton and Beale. From these two points, I will argue that a discussion of Paul's relational anthropology as it pertains to the temple metaphor must begin in 3:9 rather than 3:16.

In the second section, I will highlight how the metaphorical temple is composed of persons, which will enable me to analyze Paul's relational anthropology in chapter two through Volker Rabens' pneumatic-relational model for transformation and ethical empowerment. I will show how the temple is composed of persons by analyzing the structure of vv. 9-17 in order to establish the identity of three different metaphorical referents. This will bring clarity to the makeup of the building in vv. 9-15 and show that Paul gives us an exegetical basis to ask deeper questions of Paul's metaphor (contra Garland and Thiselton and similar to Hogeterp and Kirk). By demonstrating that (1) ἔργον refers to the people of the Corinthian congregation, that (2) the building materials refer to the quality of the builder's workmanship, and (3) that the foundation refers to Christ, I will conclude that the metaphorical temple is constituted entirely by persons. By

showing that the temple is made up of people, I will have laid the groundwork for my analysis of Paul's relational Christian self within the metaphor through Rabens' pneumatic-relational model.[43]

In the third section of this chapter, I will analyze how Paul's grid-strong language,[44] his concern with the congregation's proximity to the divine presence, and his holiness theme make Mary Douglas' structuralist methodology a helpful tool for discerning his relational anthropology within the metaphor. This will require me to make two points. First, I will suggest that Paul's discourse indicates a grid-strong cultural context in which symbolic language is capable of transmitting significant levels of information. Then, I will suggest that Paul's invocation of God's temple presence and the Corinthian's holy status reveals a framework of ritual and cosmological symbolism. Second, having established the internal coherence and thematic unity of the temple metaphor in vv. 9-17, I will argue that the holiness language and cosmological significance of vv. 16-17 should be read back into vv. 9-15 in order to bring out passage's anthropological ramifications. These moves will meet Douglas' own prerequisites for employing her structuralist approach to Paul's metaphor, allowing me in chapter three to argue that Paul's relational anthropology depicts the self as embodied and embedded within an eschatological social order.

---

[43] See the introduction to this thesis.

[44] See the introduction to this thesis.

The Composition of the Metaphorical Temple

In order to expand a temple-centered discussion of Paul's relational anthropology to include the entirety of 3:9-17, I will argue in this section that 3:9-17 is best understood as one metaphor, in which the building of 3:9-15 makes the most sense as the metaphorical temple of 3:16-17. I will make two points here. First, I will argue that Paul binds the metaphor together through the main theme of growth. Second, I will posit that the material Jerusalem temple is the most likely referent for Paul's textual temple. In making these two points, I aim to show that all of 3:9-17 is a metaphor about the Corinthian temple and a discussion of Paul's relational anthropology within the temple metaphor must include the entire pericope.

The theme of communal unity resulting from Christian holds together 3:1-17, and it is this same theme which suggests that 3:9-17 is best read as a single metaphor which contains Paul's relational anthropology. Within this metaphor, the building in 3:9-15 is identical to the temple in 3:16-17.[45] The theme of the pericope helps us make this identification. Paul's theme from 3:1-17 is the transformative growth of the Corinthian believers from fleshly people into spiritual people, with 3:5-17 continuing the explicit theme of 3:1-4. In 3:1-4, Paul laments the fact that he must continue to treat the Corinthians as a fleshly people.[46] This pericope indicates a close overlap between fleshly behavior and the human condition. Paul labels his readers as fleshly (ὡς σαρκίνοις) in

---

[45] As I noted above, this is a matter of debate. See above where I delineate the scholarly camps.

[46] I will discuss Paul's conception of σάρξ in chapter two of this thesis.

3:1.[47] He again judges them as fleshly (σαρκικοί) in 3:3, a judgment he justifies (as indicated by an explanatory γὰρ) by noting their jealousy and strife. By means of an emphatic rhetorical question (indicated by οὐχὶ), Paul again describes the Corinthians as fleshly (σαρκικοί) and as walking according to the ways of men (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε). Again employing a rhetorical question in 3:4, Paul describes the Corinthian factionalism and asks them, "Are you being merely men (οὐκ ἄνθρωποί ἐστε)?" Paul understands this fleshly, human behavior as indicative of the fact that the Corinthians are still infants in Christ (νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ), who require milk rather than solid food (3:1-2). Paul expects growth in the Christian life in the same way that a human infant grows into a full adult, and the Corinthians are in need of further growth. Paul continues the theme of growth in vv. 5-8 through an agricultural image. Just as a farmer plants his crops and waters them in the expectation of a fruitful harvest, so too is it with the Corinthians. Paul planted them, Apollos watered them, and God grew them. In 5:9, Paul then combines the agricultural image with an architectural image – the Corinthian congregation is God's fruited field[48] and building (θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε). While Paul adjusts his metaphor in v. 9, the theme remains identical. This is significant for my argument. As opposed to those (such as Conzelmann) who argue that Paul mixes his metaphors and

---

[47] For a discussion of the nuances of σαρκινοί and the different positions taken by commentators, see Ciampa and Rosner, 139-140. Cf. Conzelmann, 71; Garland, 109. Because Paul uses σαρκινοί in 3:1 and σαρκικοί 3:3 in a nearly interchangeably manner, the difference between the suffixes may be negligible in this case. As Thiselton writes, the difference is probably "one of morphology rather than semantics" (Thiselton, 288).

[48] This occurrence of γεώργιον is a New Testament *hapax legomena* meaning "cultivated field" (BDAG, 195) As Kirk notes, Paul's point of comparison is the growing plants in the field rather than the soil of the field itself (Kirk, "Building with the Corinthians", 554). In any case, the farmer expects a cultivated field to produce plants leading to a harvest.

lacks consistency,[49] I argue that Paul structures his metaphor around the idea of growth towards holiness. If the goal of a farmer's field is to produce crops, then the goal of a building project is to produce a completed structure. While Paul changes his image to one he wishes to further develop (vv. 16-17), he does not change the central idea. The concept of Christian growth toward a goal of maturity holds the two images together, and we see this in Paul's word choice of "building" (οἰκοδομή).[50] The Greek οἰκοδομή can mean both the process of construction and the edifice resulting from the construction.[51] In this passage, Paul holds both of these meanings simultaneously. In labeling the Corinthians as θεοῦ οἰκοδομή, it is as if Paul is calling them God's construction project; the process of construction currently underway has a particular building plan as the end result. This interpretation is strengthened by Paul's use of architectural language in vv. 10-15.[52] Paul characterizes his original work in Corinth as that of a master builder (ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων) who established the foundation of the metaphorical building. The verb ἔθηκα is in the aorist tense, revealing that this particular aspect of the construction job is complete. However, through his use of the present tense in the rest of v. 10, Paul indicates that the overall project in Corinth continues despite the absence of the master builder. There are those in Corinth who continue to build upon the foundation, and Paul cautions them to be careful in their manner of construction (ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδομεῖ.

---

[49] This perception of a breakdown in Paul's metaphor likely stems from the comparison theory of metaphor. According to Lakehoff and Johnson, comparison theory holds that "metaphors are matters of language and not matters of thought or action." George Lakeoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980), 153-154. Cf. Conzelmann, 75-78; Fee 149-150

[50] Hogetorp, 317.

[51] BDAG, 696-697; Otto Michel, "οἰκοδομή," *TDNT*, 5:144-145.

[52] I will address the character of the architectural terms below.

ἕκαστος δὲ βλεπέτω πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ). In vv. 11-15 Paul depicts how the building project will be tested upon its completion. Thus, throughout 3:1-15 Paul maintains the single theme of growth. While it is possible that the construction project in vv. 9-15 is different from the temple in vv. 16-17,[53] such an interpretation seems incongruous with Paul's theme of growth toward a particular goal. Rather than employing two separate metaphors with two different concepts, Paul is writing about the same concept (growth) and uses two images (fruited field and building project). He switches to the second image of a temple building project and continues with it precisely because it best matches the concept of growth in holiness. Thematically, God's temple (ναὸς θεοῦ) of v. 16 is the goal of God's building project (θεοῦ οἰκοδομή) in v. 9, which leads me to conclude that 3:9-17 is a single metaphor. By analyzing the theme of 3:9-17, I have argued that this pericope is a temple metaphor in which we can see the contours of Paul's relational anthropology.

A rhetorical analysis of 3:9-17 likewise demonstrates that the passage is a single temple metaphor in which we will see Paul's relational understanding of the self. While the theme of growth suggests that the temple of vv. 16-17 is the end result of the construction in vv. 9-15, Paul's rhetorical cues likewise make it likely that Paul has a single building in mind.[54] In 3:16, Paul rhetorically asks his readers, "Do you not know that you are the temple of God (Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε)?" The phrase οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι bears further examination because the phrase is a rhetorical signpost to Paul's readers,

---

[53] Strack, 230.

[54] Similarly, see Hogeterp, 311-314. Hogeterp does not build on the theme of growth to the same degree as I do. I believe that this leads him to view the rhetorical unit as encompassing 3:9-17 rather than 3:1-17.

the nature of which is debated. Some commentators agree that Paul is reminding the Corinthians of the theology that he himself taught them during his stay in Corinth (or at the very least, an obvious implication of his theology).[55] However, Lanci notes that evidence from Greco-Roman rhetorical studies shows that the typical function of the οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι construction is to recall topics and propositions that the writer or speaker wishes to emphasize for later development in the course of his argument.[56] While the first option cannot be ruled out given the regularity of this image both in the Corinthian correspondence[57] and early Christianity in general,[58] three indicators in Paul's argument make it more likely that Paul is emphasizing to his readers that they are the temple of God and that this is a topic he wishes to develop throughout his epistle. First, the direct address in v. 16 combined with the threat of judgment in v. 17 indicates that this temple metaphor is the rhetorical climax of a single rhetorical motif, in which the building project of vv. 9-15 is revealed to be God's Corinthian temple.[59] Second, Paul raises the temple imagery again in 6:19, (albeit in applying it to the individual Christian). Third, Paul will again use the image of a building project in 14:1-26 that reflects the Corinthian

---

[55] Conzelmann, 77; Liu, 121; I. Howard Marshall, "Church and Temple in the New Testament," *Tyndale Bulletin* 40, no. 2 (Nov 1989):, 213; Robertson and Plummer, 66.

[56] Lanci, 119-120. Cf. Collins, 16; Ciampa and Rosner, 158-159; Fitzmyer, 202.

[57] 1 Cor. 6:19; 2 Cor. 6:14 – 7:1.

[58] Marshall, "Church and Temple," 203-222.

[59] This is in contrast to Kuck who writes, "That vv. 16-17 form a distinct rhetorical unit is signaled not only by the new image of the temple but also by the direct address to the readers in οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι…ἔστε. In good rhetorical style Paul prepares his readers for his punch line by reminding them of what they already know about themselves" (Kuck,), 186). However, given the conceptual imagery of growth of 3:1-15, it seems arbitrary to label vv. 16-17 as a "distinct rhetorical unit."

community as an ongoing building project in which God already dwells.[60] In 14:12,[61] Paul describes how the gifts of the Spirit are for the building up of the church (πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας). Paul uses the same noun οἰκοδομή (from 3:9) in 14:3, 5, and 26. He also uses the verbal form of οἰκοδομή (οἰκοδομέω) twice in 14:4. Not only does Paul continue to use the construction imagery in chapter 14, but he once again employs an infant-adult metaphor in 14:20 (similar to 3:2). What is the result of the building up of the church in maturity? Paul indicates in 14:25 that the unbeliever will recognize God's divine presence in the midst of the Corinthians. The unbeliever will acknowledge that the Holy Spirit truly dwells within the Corinthians (similar to 3:16-17). This is clearly temple language once more. Because Paul echoes both the language and the theme of 3:1-17 in 14:1-26, Lanci is correct to identify the οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι construction of 3:16 as both a rhetorical evocation of the topic of this epistle and the thematic climax of the rhetorical unit of 3:1-17. Given the thematic unity and rhetorical structure of 3:1-17, the construction project of vv. 9-15 and the temple of vv. 16-17 are one and the same.[62] This rhetorical analysis of 3:9-17 suggests that this pericope is best understood as a temple metaphor, which I will later analyze to highlight Paul's relational anthropology.

---

[60] Kuck, 173.

[61] According to Margaret M. Mitchell, 1 Corinthians is a unified epistle. Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville,. KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), 180-295. Cf. Conzelmann, 2-6.

[62] In light of this unified metaphor, the image of God's cultivated field (θεοῦ γεώργιον) of v. 9 complements rather than clashes with the image of God's building (θεοῦ οἰκοδομή) (Cf. Fee 149-150; Fitzmyer, 196; Garland, 114-119). In the ancient world, people often cultivated sacred land. Thus, both a temple and adjacent farmland might be considered sacred. In such cases, those who worked the land would take the necessary ritual precautions. See Linda-Marie Günther, "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*, eds. Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), 245-260. This is more likely than Beale's supposition that Paul is specifically envisioning a garden-temple (Beale, 245-253). His interpretation is beyond the scope of the text.

Having proposed that the thematic unity of vv. 9-17 along with the rhetorical cues of vv. 16-17 indicate that Paul is using an extended temple metaphor throughout the passage, I will now probe the identity of this particular temple because the temple's identity is central to Paul's understanding of the Christian self. Does Paul have a particular temple in mind, or does his argument simply utilize the motif of the divine presence within a temple? An analysis of Paul's imagery, vocabulary, and syntax suggests that Paul's referent is the temple in Jerusalem. Paul clearly uses imagery that would apply well to this particular structure, as the work of G. K. Beale demonstrates. According to Beale, Paul describes the Corinthians in 3:10-15 using language drawn from the Hebrew Scriptures, in particular passages which describe the Mosaic tabernacle and the Solomonic Temple.[63] In 1 Cor. 3:10, Paul calls himself a wise master builder (ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων), a term that Ex. 31:3 and 35:31-32 (LXX) use to describe the builder Bezalel who oversaw the construction of the LORD's Tabernacle.[64] Beale also notes regarding vv. 11-15, "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."[65] Furthermore, Paul's choice of vocabulary in vv. 16-17 suggests that Paul has the Jerusalem temple in mind. Paul characterizes the Corinthians in those verses using the Greek ναός rather than ἱερόν. While this vocabulary choice alone might not signify much,[66] Paul's choice takes on greater significance when combined with the

---

[63] Beale, 245-253.

[64] Ibid, 247.

[65] Ibid. In the LXX see 1 Kgs 5:17; 6:20-21; 1 Chr. 22:14; 29:2.

[66] Some scholars (Barton, "The Jerusalem Temple," 374; Böttrich, 416; Fee, 158; Hogetorp, 322-323; Liu, 121) believe that Paul is describing the Corinthians as a sanctuary (indicated by ναός) rather than the

Mosaic tabernacle and Solomonic temple imagery in vv. 11-15 and his reminder that

God's Spirit dwells in the Corinthians in v. 16 (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν). The

LXX often depicts the Holy of Holies as the specific site of God's presence within the

Tabernacle/Temple.[67] This makes Paul's choice of ναός over ἱερόν seem deliberate; the

Corinthians experience the proximity of the divine presence as if they were the Holy of

Holies in Jerusalem.[68] This would coincide with Hogeterp's observation in that both the

LXX and Josephus describe the Jerusalem Temple as God's building (οἰκοδομή θεοῦ).[69]

Alongside imagery and vocabulary, syntax also suggests that Paul is comparing the

Corinthians to the Jerusalem temple. Fee notes that according to Colwell's rule the

construction ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε in 1 Cor. 3:16 should be understood as definite (often

overlooked by some scholars),[70] i.e. the church is *the* temple of God.[71] Although there

was debate at this time within Jewish circles as to the legitimacy of the Jerusalem temple

---

temple complex (indicated by ἱερόν). However, as Thiselton notes, this goes beyond the meaning of the Greek (Thiselton, 316). While the LXX usually reflects such a distinction, the same cannot be said for the Hellenistic world (LSJ, 822, 1160) nor for the Gospels (Lanci, 91-93; Michel, "ναός," in *TDNT*, 4:880-891).

[67] Ex. 25: 17-22; 28:29-30; Lev. 10:1-3; 16:1-2; 1 Kgs. 1:8.

[68] Contra J. Massyngberde Ford, "You Are God's 'Sukkah' (I Cor. III 10-17)," *New Testament Studies* 21 (1974): 139-142.

[69] Hogeterp, 318-319.

[70] Ciampa and Rosner, 158-161; Kuck, 186-188; Lanci, 124-125; Wardle, 210-212; Witherington, 134. Cf. Collins, 160-161; Fitzmyer, 202-203; Garland, 191-121; Robertson and Plummer, 66; Thiselton, 316.

[71] Fee, 159. Fee understands this to be a geographic reference to a particular congregation and warns against extended application toward the individual. In other words, in a particular city God can only be found in the church. Fee likewise warns against reading 6:19-20 back into the passage. However, Fee does not seriously consider the possibility that Paul envisions the church as a replacement to the Jerusalem temple. Given Beale's study, this needs to be seriously considered. For caution regarding misapplication of Colwell's rule, see Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 256-270.

and whether it served as God's only earthly dwelling place,[72] Paul himself generally

displays a positive-attitude toward the Jerusalem temple.[73] When taken together, the

language we find in Paul's temple metaphor is most fitted for God's temple in Jerusalem,

which will shape my later discussion of the relational Christian self in Paul's

anthropology.[74]

As we seek to clarify Paul's temple metaphor for the sake of analyzing his

relational anthropology, we must note that holiness is Paul's point of comparison

between the Corinthian congregation and the Jerusalem temple. The parallelism of vv.

16-17 serves to explain why the construction workers in vv. 12-15 are subject to such

harsh standards and punishment: they labor upon a holy building. God protects his temple

and will destroy any who attempt to destroy it (v. 17). Paul gives an explanation for

God's action in the second half of v. 17 when he writes, "For the temple of God is holy,

which you are (ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς)."[75] The construction

of this sentence should give us pause. The masculine plural pronoun οἵτινές does not

grammatically correspond to ναός or ἅγιός. These are both masculine singular words. The

grammatical disconnect can initially be explained as serving to rhetorically heighten the

---

[72] Timothy Wardle, *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity* (Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 13-155.

[73] As noted by Frederick William Horn, "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel," *New Testament Studies* 53, no. 2 (April 2007): 196-199; Paula Fredricksen, "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 2 (April 2010): 248.

[74] Cf Böttrich, 411-423. Böttrich views the temple metaphor as broadly referencing temple imagery in general rather than a specific temple. This assumes that the recipients of the epistle were largely of Gentile origin or unfamiliar with the Hebrew Scriptures. Likewise see Strack, 233-234.

[75] I will address this in greater detail below.

corporal unity of the individual members of the Corinthian congregation.[76] At the same

time, there is another result to this construct. The ambiguity itself also allows οἵτινές to

correspond both to ναός and to ἅγιός. The Corinthian congregation is a temple *and* its

members are holy. Paul reveals in v. 17 reveals the precise point of the temple connection

which he initially made in v. 16. Holiness is fundamental to the nature of a temple and to

the status of the Corinthian congregation. Paul has been developing his theme of growth,

with holiness being characteristic of what it means to be a spiritual person. As noted

above, vv. 16-17 is a topic which Paul will develop throughout his letter, with ethics and

holiness being central to chs. 5-12. When Paul cites the temple identity once more in 6:19

it is in reference to pursuing holiness. Thus, just as the Jerusalem temple is holy so too

are the Corinthians holy.[77] As I trace Paul's relational anthropology within his temple

metaphor, I will argue further in chapter three that this comparison to the holiness of the

Jerusalem temple is central to his understanding of the relational self.

　　While holiness is Paul's direct point of comparison in his metaphor, it is God's

relational presence in the Jerusalem temple and in the Corinthian community which

enables this, a presence which I will later argue is central to how Paul views the self to be

relationally constructed. Paul writes in v. 16, "God's Spirit dwells in you (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ

θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν)." While it may be argued that the prepositional phrase ἐν ὑμῖν should

be understood as a dative of content or thing possessed,[78] parallels in Second-Temple

---

[76] Fitzmyer, 203-204.

[77] Harrington argues that in describing the metaphorical temple as ἅγιός. Paul leaves us little doubt that he has the Jerusalem temple in mind rather than local pagan shrines. Harrington rightly argues that Paul would never have considered these shrines as "holy" (Harrington, 327). See also Ciampa and Rosner, 158-159.

[78] Barrett, 90

literature suggests otherwise. These authors tend to emphasize God's transcendence and thus interpret his temple presence as symbolic.[79] For example, in interpreting the cloud of God's glory in the Solomonic temple, Josephus strongly tempers God's localized presence in the Temple in order to emphasize his transcendence. He writes that the cloud "produced in the minds of all of them an impression and belief that God had descended into the temple and had gladly made His abode there."[80] Likewise, 2 Macc. describes God's visible presence in the Jerusalem temple as "epiphanies."[81] Above all, in the greatest biblical depiction of God's presence in the Solomonic temple, Solomon himself confesses that the temple is far too small to contain God's presence, suggesting that the glorious cloud is symbolic of God's benevolent presence in Israel's midst.[82] Other scholars have appealed to Stoic temple analogies which would lend weight toward interpreting ἐν ὑμῖν as a dative of content or thing possessed.[83] However, this appeal breaks down when the Stoic analogies are examined in greater detail.[84] As Rabens' model

---

[79] At the same time, both Greeks and Romans wrestled with the idea of their gods being confined to their temples. Cicero acknowledges that both the Greeks and the Romans believe that their gods live in the cities with them, whereas the Persians believe "that this whole universe is their temple and home" (Cicero, *Laws* 2.10.16. Cf. Herodotus 1.131). Juvenal, by contrasts, mocks the "simplicity" of those who "believe that some divinity is to be found in temples or in altars red with blood" (Juvenal, *Satire* 13.34-37).

[80] Josephus *Ant.* 8.4.2 (106). Cf. Ben Sira 24:10, which describes God's personified wisdom as dwelling in the tabernacle in Jerusalem.

[81] 2 Macc. 2:21; 3:22-30; 10:29-31.

[82] 1 Kgs. 8:27; 2 Chron. 6:18.

[83] Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010), 96-97, 169-170.

[84] See Reinhard Achenbach, "The Empty Throne and the Empty Sanctuary: From Aniconism to the Invisibility of God in Second Temple Theology," in *Ritual Innovation in the Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism*, ed. Nathan MacDonald (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 35-53; Philip N. Richardson, *Temple of the Living God: The Influence of Hellenistic Philosophy on Paul's Figurative Temple Language Applied to the Corinthians* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2018), 36-81

would predict, I believe that Paul is more likely employing a dative of association;[85]

God's Spirit is relationally present with the Corinthians.[86] There are two good reasons for

this particular interpretation. First, understanding ἐν ὑμῖν as a dative of association

accords with Paul's frequent relational use of prepositions (Rom. 2:17; 6:4-6, 8; 8:1;

12:5; 2 Cor. 13:5; Gal. 2:20; 1 Thess. 4:17).[87] Second, both Greco-Roman pagans[88] and

Jewish[89] authors understood temples to be symbols of a benevolent relationship with

God(s), in which God(s) was relationally present in some way with the community.[90]

Further, the LXX describes the temple as housing the Ark of the Covenant (διαθήκη), the

---

[85] Wallace, 372.

[86] Fee, 158-160.

[87] Rabens, 135.

[88] Tacitus, *Histories* 3.72. He understands the temple in a quasi-covenantal way. Tacitus wrote that the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus functioning as a sort of "pledge of empire (*pignus imperii*)" between Jupiter and the Romans. Consequently, when the Romans conquered the Greek city-states, they ransacked the temples and sent the idols and sacred objects back to Rome (Lanci, 96). On the flip side, Romans saw their ability to conquer a foreign people as evidence that foreign gods had joined their city's cause. Eric M. Orlin, *Temples, Religion, and Politics in the Roman Republic* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2002), 190.

[89] 2 Macc. 5:19 describes the temple's location as a result of God's election of the Jewish race. (Hogeterp, 29).

[90] Since Martin Hengel's work, the terms "Greco-Roman" and "Jewish" have fallen under justifiable suspicion. Jewish people underwent Hellenization, obtained Roman citizenship, and articulated their thoughts like their counterparts in Rome or on the Greek peninsula. See Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1974), *passim*. However, both John J. Collins and John M. G. Barclay have shown that Jews themselves felt a tension between their dual identities and sought to navigate this tension in different ways, often either displaying antagonism toward or convergence with Hellenization. See John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996), *passim*; John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), *passim*. Rabens helpfully writes, "Nevertheless, it is still helpful to distinguish between the (non-Jewish) world of Hellen*ism* and Hellen*ization* (of Judaism, etc.). Levine points out that 'Hellenism…refers to the cultural milieu (largely Greek) of the Hellenistic, Roman, and - to a somewhat more limited extent – Byzantine periods, while Hellenization describes the process of adoption and adaptation of this culture on a local level'" (Rabens, 25). I use the term "Greco-Roman" and "Jewish" as shorthand for the above dynamics and for lack of better alternatives.

symbolic representation of God's covenant relationship with Israel.[91] Similar to Jones'

proposal in his linguistic analysis of God's holy presence in Israel,[92] Paul uses the

language of temple presence to convey the intimacy of the Corinthian's relationship with

the God of Israel, thus allowing him to highlight the Corinthians as a holy people. God's

relational presence in the Corinthian community is central to Corinthian holiness and

subsequently for Paul's relational anthropology.

If Paul's point of comparison in the temple metaphor is the holiness of the

Corinthian community (a point made possible by God's relational-presence in both the

Jerusalem temple and the Corinthians), then the ethical reality in Corinth seems to clash

sharply with the source domain of the metaphor and thereby informs us of how Paul

understands the Christian self. Simply surveying the Old Testament pattern of temple

presence reveals the disanalogies between Jerusalem and Corinth. Paul depicts the

Corinthians as still under construction (vv. 10-15)[93] yet already God's Spirit dwells in the

incomplete temple (vv. 16-17). Yet in Ex. 40 and 2 Chron. 5 God's people observed

God's presence descending upon the holy structures only after they were fully completed

and subsequently consecrated.[94] Likewise, Paul paints a dire picture of the ethical

situation in the Corinthian community: division (1:10-17), boasting (4:6-8), incest (5:1-

5), lawsuits (6:1-11), and visits to prostitutes (6:12-16). This is the type of behavior for

---

[91] Gregory Stevenson, *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 129. Two of Israel's kings reflect on God's covenant with Israel in the presence of the temple (1 Kings 8:21-26; 2 Kings 23:1-3).

[92] O. R. Jones, *The Concept of Holiness* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961).

[93] See below for the significance of Paul's construction language for the makeup of the temple.

[94] Cf. Roman patterns of consecration. Linke, "Sacral Purity," 295-296.

which Solomon's temple was destroyed, and Jewish writers understood such actions as responsible for driving God's presence from the temple.[95] While it may appear that Paul's temple metaphor is an ill-fit for the experience of the Corinthian community given his description of their ethical life and his own departure from the Old Testament pattern of temple indwelling,[96] I wish to suggest that it actually illustrates Paul's innovative use of the temple as a symbol; he envisions the temple as composed of people.[97] In the next section, I will show how Paul depicts the metaphorical temple as composed of people, which both makes for complex coherence with the source domain of the holy temple in Jerusalem and illuminates his relational anthropology.

---

[95] Jacob Milgrom, "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Grey,'" *Revue biblique* 83, no. 3 (1976): 390-399.

[96] Cf Fredricksen, "Judaizing the Nations," 248-250. It seems unlikely that Paul was showing that the Gentiles were ritually-pure and thus capable of participating in the rituals of the Jerusalem Temple. Moreover, Paul does not address concrete ritual concerns until 1 Cor. 10:16 (even if he employs ritual language and imagery). The ethical failings of the Corinthians in the intervening chapters suggest precisely the opposite: the Corinthians' were morally impure, thus excluding them from the rituals of the Jerusalem temple. Paul appears to have paraenetic aims rather than ritualistic aims. See Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000), 153-157. Cf. Jason T. Lamoreaux, "Ritual Negotiation in 1 Corinthians: Pauline Authority and the Corinthian Community," *Neotestamentica* 50 (2016): 397-422.

[97] Cf. Brian S. Rosner, "Temple and Holiness in 1 Cor. 5," *Tyndale Bulletin* 42, no. 1 (1991): 137-145. Rosner writes that "the conception of the community as a temple is a scriptural theme, where the divine indwelling is not just of a sanctuary but of a people" (140). He cites as his justification for this claim Ex. 25:8; 29:45; Lev. 26:11f; Ezk. 11:16; 37:26-28; Ps. 114:2. However, when one examines these passages in detail, every single one (with the exception of Ps. 114:2) makes a clear distinction between the sanctuary and the people of Israel. These passages depict God as indwelling the sanctuary, his dwelling which is in the midst of the people. This is significantly different from equating the people of Israel to the temple (Rosner's position). Ps. 114:2 speaks of Judah as being God's sanctuary and Israel as God's dominion. Ps. 114 uses high poetic images, and I find it difficult to arrive at Rosner's position from this passage. As further evidence of his claim, Rosner cites Jeremiah 7:4 in the Peshitta: "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, you (plural) are a temple of the Lord" (140). The plural reference in the MT is likely a reference to the multiple buildings in the temple complex. William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1-25*, ed. Paul D. Hanson, Hermeneia (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1986), 242. The Peshitta is likely a response to the destruction of the Second Temple in which the author is textualizing the temple (Barton, "The Jerusalem Temple," 372-375). In light of this, Paul is truly innovative in his use of temple symbolism. Regarding the Qumran community and its temple symbolism, see below.

In this first section, I proposed that the metaphorical temple of 3:16-17 matches Paul's description of the building project in 3:10-15. I made two points in this section. With my first point, I suggested that 3:9-17 continues Paul's discussion of Christian growth which he started in 3:1, and this concern unites the metaphor. In my second point, I concluded that the temple in Jerusalem functioned as the most likely referent for Paul's metaphorical temple. By these two means, I contended that the building project of 3:10-15 is in reality a *temple* building project.

The Metaphorical Temple: Composed of People?

In the second section, I will show that Paul understands his metaphorical temple to be composed of persons, which will enable me to use Rabens' model on the metaphor in the subsequent chapter, where I will examine Paul's relational anthropology. An analysis of vv. 9-17 will reveal three different metaphorical referents. These referents are all persons. As such, I will deem it appropriate to apply Rabens' model to the metaphorical temple as I seek to demonstrate Paul's understanding of the relationally-constituted self.

To see the temple as composed of people and therefore open to Rabens' relational method of interpretation, we must read the construction imagery of vv. 9-15 in light of the temple identity of vv. 16-17. Such a reading suggests that the temple is composed of "living stones," to borrow a Petrine phrase.[98] Is this reading going beyond the bounds of Paul's metaphor?[99] While it is certainly possible to go beyond the limits of Paul's

---

[98] Cf. 1 Peter 2:5.

[99] See Collins, 249; Fitzmyer, 203-204, 269-270; Thiselton, 315-316.

metaphor here,[100] Paul himself confirms my "living stones" suspicion by offering the key to 3:10-15 in 4:1-6. We can use the explanation there as a guide to the eschatological language in 3:10-15 and its pertinence to the nature of the temple construction. In 4:6, Paul writes, "So I have applied these things to myself and Apollo for you, brethren, in order that you might not go beyond that which is written so that not one of you might be puffed up against the other (Ταῦτα δέ, ἀδελφοί, μετεσχημάτισα εἰς ἐμαυτὸν καὶ Ἀπολλῶν δι' ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται, ἵνα μὴ εἷς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου)." The phrase "these things" (indicated by the demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα and the connective δέ) refers to Paul's discussion of the Lord's judgment in 4:1-5 and to the figures in the metaphor of temple construction in 3:9-17.[101] In 4:1-3, Paul speaks of himself and Apollo as servants and stewards who are required to be faithful to God in their charges. Paul then says that he himself will be judged by the Lord when the Lord returns. On that day, writes Paul in v. 5, every steward will receive his appropriate commendation from God because the Lord "will both illuminate the hidden things of the darkness and will manifest the counsels of the hearts (ὃς καὶ φωτίσει τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους καὶ φανερώσει τὰς βουλὰς τῶν καρδιῶν)." This clear explanation of the Lord's return and Paul's application of the Parousia to himself and Apollo will serve as a control

---

[100] Herbert Morrison Gale, *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1964), 83-88. Gale warns about the difference between metaphor and allegory here.

[101] Morna D. Hooker, "'Beyond the Things Which Are Written': An Examination of I Cor. IV. 6," *New Testament Studies* 10, no. 1 (Oct 1963): 127-132. Hooker's interpretation makes good sense within the context of the Paul's argumentative flow, and resolves the translation difficulty of μετεσχημάτισα. See also on this issue Donald P. Ker, "Paul and Apollos – Colleagues or Rivals?" *Journal for the Study of New Testament* 22, no. 77 (July 2000): 90-93. Cf. Boykin Sanders, "Imitating Paul: 1 Cor. 4:16," *Harvard Theological Review* 74, no. 4 (1981): 353-363.

for us as we examine the composition of the Corinthian temple in 3:10-15 and see how it is made up of persons.

Having shown that 4:1-5 serves as the control for the metaphor in 3:10-15, I can now clarify one aspect of Paul's person-temple as I develop his relational anthropology: Paul's eschatologically-oriented construction language in 3:10-15 describes the Corinthian teachers rather than to the Corinthian congregation more broadly. Paul calls himself a "skilled master-builder (σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων)." Throughout the epistle, Paul mocks the wisdom (σοφία) of this present age[102] that has created partisanship in the Corinthian congregation.[103] Paul uses σοφός ironically here, as it can mean both "skilled" or "wise" depending on the context.[104] He then describes other builders using a string of indefinite pronouns in v. 10: another (ἄλλος) is building on Paul's foundation, each (ἕκαστος) should take care in building, and no one (οὐδείς) can build apart from Christ. While some scholars view this as a vague critique of Apollos, this is unlikely given that Paul shows no hostility to Apollos elsewhere in the letter. Moreover, Paul uses the

---

[102] The literature is vast on this subject, usually pairing mirror readings of 1 Corinthians with archeological evidence from Corinth itself. The success of such attempts are mixed. Each approach helps to bring general clarity to the epistle, but usually results in imposing a singular reading to a text that addresses a complex, divided congregation. Consequently, these singular readings can create exegetical confusion. In particular, see John K. Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 1992), *passim*; Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), *passim*; Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity*, trans. John H. Schütz (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1982), *passim*; Bruce W. Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), *passim*. However, since Barclay's study on ancient gift-giving in Paul, Chow's study of Corinthian patronage has become even more helpful. See John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015), *passim*. All the above works note the importance of wisdom to the Corinthians. Where they diverge is how to interpret this wisdom. See Oh-Young Kwon, "A Critical Review of Recent Scholarship on the Pauline Opposition and the Nature of Its Wisdom (Σοφία) in 1 Corinthians 1-4," *Currents in Biblical Research* 8, no. 3 (2010): 386-427.

[103] 1 Cor. 1:18-25; 2:6-13; 3:18-23; 15:35-41.

[104] Ulrich Wilkens, "σοφία, σοφός" in *TDNT*, 7:465-526.

present tense to describe an ongoing situation in Corinth, while Apollos is presently away

from Corinth (16:12). This suggests that Paul is addressing those Corinthians who are

aligning themselves into factions, claiming to follow either Paul or Apollos (3:4), and are

puffing themselves up against one another (4:6).[105] This would be in accordance with the

patronage culture of Greco-Roman Corinth.[106] Such an interpretation is also consistent

with the internal logic of the metaphor; namely, Paul and Apollos together worked on the

Corinthian building project through their work as teachers (3:9). Earlier in the passage

(3:2) Paul spoke of his work of teaching[107] as feeding the Corinthians with milk rather

than solid food. However, they remained infants who could not receive mature teaching.

Thus, Paul's teaching about Christ in 3:2 is equivalent to the act of laying a foundation in

3:10.[108] As such, Paul is the apostolic master-builder upon whose teaching others,

whether Apollos or the Corinthian teachers, continue to build through their teaching.[109]

---

[105] Strack comes to this same conclusion through a rhetorical analysis of the text. He writes, "Beim Abschnitt 1 Kor 3,5-17 handelt es sich rhetorisch um die argumentatio, näherhin die probatio, in der die Richtigkeit der einenen Meinung positiv aufgewiesen werden soll. 1 Kor 3,5-17 greift auf das exordium 1,10-17 zurück, wo der Parteienstreit das erste Mal dargelegt wurde, und stellt Jesus Christus als wahrhaft einzigen Grund der Verkündigung heraus (VV 10f) und Gott selbst als Subjekt und Eigentümer der Gemeinde" (Strack, 227).

[106] Chow, 103, 172-173.

[107] Fitzmyer, 187. Kuck sees this as applying generally to the believer (Kuck, 172-173). While it certainly applies, it seems that the particular focus of this passage is on teaching. Kuck may miss this because his study begins at 3:5 rather than 3:1.

[108] Similar to Thiselton, 310. This resolves the supposed contradiction of v. 11. Cf. Conzelmann, 75.

[109] Shanor, 465-466. Shanor argues based on Arcadian construction tablets that this understanding of the metaphor would have been naturally understood by an urban population surrounded by temple construction. Hollander writes, "It is true that in 1 Corinthians there are references to the individual responsibility for the upbuilding of the Christian community (see e.g. 12.7; 14.3-5, 12, 26). But in view of the direct context, esp. 3.4-5 and 3.21-22, it is more plausible that Paul is referring to those people who were appointed to be missionaries and teachers." Harm W. Hollander, "The Testing By Fire of the Builders' Works: 1 Corinthians 3.10-15," *New Testament Studies* 40, no. 1 (Jan. 1994): 92 n.15. See also Conzelmann, 75; Garland, 115; Robertson and Plummer, 62; Strack, 229 Cf. Kuck, 174.

Paul then goes on to warn all workers (including himself and Apollo, as Paul reveals in

4:1-6) in 3:10 to be careful in their manner of building/teaching (πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ). They

should be careful because all workers (especially those in authority) will be judged for

their construction work as they labor on God's temple.[110] With 4:1-6 serving as our

interpretive tool for Paul's words in 3:9-15, we see that Paul directs his words in 3:10

towards Christian workers, which allows us to identify the other referents in the

Corinthian temple metaphor and eventually reach the conclusion that the Corinthian

temple is constituted by persons.

Having identified Christian teachers as the likeliest referent for the builders in

3:10-15, I suggest that the product of the construction is the Corinthian congregation, i.e.

the temple and therefore the Petrine notion of "living stones" is applicable to this

metaphor. Close analysis of the building's components reveals a difference between the

foundation (with the referent being Christ),[111] the building materials (with the referent

being the manner of building), and the product of the building materials (with the referent

being the people of the Corinthian congregation). The structure of the passage is

complicated, and only by paying close attention to the structure will we be able to clearly

discern the referents in the metaphor. Vv. 10-11 form a chiasm whose themes are the

---

[110] Williams argues that Paul alluding to Isa. 5:1-7. If Williams is correct, then this strengthens my argument given Isaiah's context. See H. H. Drake Williams, III, *The Wisdom of the Wise: The Presence and Function of Scripture within 1 Cor. 1:18-3:23* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2001), 237-255.

[111] This is one of the primary reasons I believe that comparisons with the Qumran community are not helpful. Paul identifies the foundation of the temple-community with an individual (Christ), whereas the foundation in 1 QS is the community itself. Paul has a very different conception of the community than does Qumran. Even if there were similarities, there is still much uncertainty surrounding the temple metaphors in the Dead Sea community as well as its relationship to the temple in Jerusalem. For this reason, I will not be drawing comparisons as I do not find them helpful. See Eyal Regev, "Community as Temple: Revisiting Cultic Metaphors in Qumran and the New Testament," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 28, no. 4 (2018): 609-611.

identity of the foundation (Christ) and the quality of the construction process (the manner

of building).[112] Paul warns the teachers[113] to be cautious regarding the manner of their

building on the foundation, indicated by the adverb πῶς.[114] After writing in 3:11 that

Jesus Christ is the one and only foundation of the temple, Paul then transitions in v. 12

from the temple's foundation to the quality of the temple's construction, indicated by the

third class condition of v. 12-15 introduced by the transitional conjunction δέ. The

protasis in v. 12 is an anacoluthon, seemingly missing the apodosis at first glance.[115] In v.

12, Paul lists building materials according to their inflammability (gold, silver, precious

stones) and flammability (wood, hay, and straw).[116] The apodosis of v. 12 appears in vv.

14-15, which Saiz describes as a strict parallel construction that expresses the exact same

idea, albeit in an antithetical form.[117] V. 13 acts as a parenthetical statement between the

protasis and apodosis explaining the necessity of choosing fire-resistant building

materials.[118] This parenthetical is important because it elucidates the difference between

ἔργον and the building materials. The building materials form the work and should be

considered when judging the quality of the work; the work is the end product of the

---

[112] Fee, 147; Thiselton, 307.

[113] While the context and metaphor suggest that Paul's words most directly apply to the Corinthian leaders, they remain applicable for all members of the Corinthian congregation. This is indicated by the third-person present imperative βλεπέτω, indicating a general action irrespective of precise circumstances (Ciampa and Rosner, 152).

[114] BDAG, 900-901. Cf. Kirk, 562-564.

[115] Jose Ramon Busto Saiz, "¿Se Salvara Como Atravesando Fuego? 1 Cor 3,15b Reconsiderado," *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 68, no. 266 (Jul-Sep 1993): 335.

[116] Garland, 116-117.

[117] Saiz, "1 Cor 3,15b Reconsiderado," 336

[118] Ibid.

building materials used.[119] Given the structure of vv. 10-15 and the context of the passage

as Paul's address to teachers, I understand the teaching done by the Corinthians as the

referent behind the metaphorical building materials.[120] This means that the "work" is the

temple itself – the people of God.[121] The "work" of building up the temple and edifying

the people very much depends on the quality of the teaching.[122] Bad quality of material

results in bad workmanship which will not endure the Lord's test at his return. The

workman's payment depends on the quality of his workmanship. After paying attention

to the structure of vv. 10-15 in light of Paul's words in 1 Cor. 4, I believe that the Petrine

conception of "living stones" is applicable to Paul's metaphorical temple structure.

Not only does the Corinthian congregation make up the "living stones" which

form the metaphorical temple, but the fire imagery of vv. 14-15 now takes on new

significance by showing that the builders are as much a part of the person-constituted

temple as much as their work is. Paul acknowledges in v. 14 that the builder will receive

---

[119] Cf. Kirk, "Building with the Corinthians," 554-560. Kirk argues that both the building materials and ἔργον refer to the Corinthian people. While I sympathize with this position, the structure of the passage lends itself to reading the two elements as separate yet related.

[120] Ciampa and Rosner, 153-154; Ronald Herms, "'Being Saved Without Honor': A Conceptual Link Between 1 Corinthians 3 and 1 Enoch 50?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29, no. 2 (Dec 2006): 202-204; Shanor, 467. The similarities to Mal. 3 reinforce this interpretation. See John Proctor, "Fire in God's House: Influence of Malachi 3 in the NT," *Journal of the Evangelical Society* 36, no. 1 (March, 1993): 11-13. Williams argues that Paul is citing Isa. 3:3 and Mal. 3:2-3 (Williams, 257-265). Cf. Fitzmyer, 158; Strack, 299.

[121] See 1 Cor. 9:1, where Paul writes of the Corinthians οὐ τὸ ἔργον μου ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν κυρίῳ; Cf. Conzelmann, 76; Hollander, 91-92. Engberg-Pedersen's failure to identify ἔργον as the Corinthian people contributes to his misreading of the passage. He equates the temple with the pneuma itself in part because he presupposes that the worker is identical with their work. However, if that work is another person, his conclusions cannot be sustained (Engberg-Pedersen, 247 n.57).

[122] Kuck argues that Paul "is interested in the fact of the variety of workmanship rather than in defining what is good work and what is not." How he arrives at this conclusion is unclear, especially since he immediately notes that Paul in vv. 12-15 focuses on "different levels of quality in the work of different individuals." Kuck, 173.

a reward should his work survives the fire of the Parousia.[123] In v. 15, Paul writes that the builder whose work is consumed by the fire of the Parousia will be saved οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός (usually translated as "but only as if through fire"). This particular expression has been hotly debated with reference to the role of works in Pauline thought, with some puzzled by the fact that Paul apparently makes a distinction between the eschatological fate of a false teacher and that of the disciple.[124] This controversy results from a misunderstanding of the meaning of οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός. The vast majority of commentators have understood this phrase to be a proverbial expression similar to Amos 4:11 and Zech 3:2 and equivalent to the English phrase "saved by the skin of one's teeth."[125] However, Kirk has thoroughly demonstrated that this supposed proverbial expression does not appear in the Greek sources with any grammatical or conceptual consistency.[126] Furthermore, 1 Cor. 3:15 shares a single word in common with Amos 4:11 and Zech 3:2 (πῦρ) whereas the latter two verses are identical to another.[127] Rather than interpreting οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός as a proverb, we should understand it better as a

---

[123] Paul writes in v. 13 that Christ will reveal the work of the Corinthians on the Day of the Lord. Paul has already referred to this event in 1 Cor. 1:7-8 and thus simply refers to it here as ἡ ἡμέρα without any further elaboration. Likewise, this is a frequent theme in Paul's letters (Rom. 2:16; 4:5; 13:12; 1 Cor. 1:8; 5:5; 2 Cor. 1:14; Phil. 1:6, 10; 2:16; 1 Thess 5:2, 4; 2 Thess. 2:2) (Thiselton, 313). In v. 13, ambiguity surrounds the subject of the verb ἀποκαλύπτεται, which could either be rendered as middle or passive voice. What is revealed: ἡ ἡμέρα or τὸ ἔργον? The ambiguity seems purposeful in this case, with the same result no matter how you read it. For an interpretation of ἀποκαλύπτεται in the passive voice, see Thiselton, 312-313. For an interpretation of ἀποκαλύπτεται in the middle voice, see Fee, 142. Whether the day reveals itself by fire or the work is revealed in the fire which will accompany the day, the work of the builders will ultimately be tested by the fire and judgment of Christ (as v. 13z affirms).

[124] Fee is representative in this regard, (Fee, 154-157).

[125] Fee, 156. Engberg-Pedersen sums up majority scholarship when he writes, "I am presupposing here the unfashionable view that Paul's talk of being saved 'as through fire' should be taken completely literally" (Engberg-Pedersen, 247 n. 57).

[126] Kirk, "Building with the Corinthians," 566.

[127] Ibid.

reference to God's testing of the entire temple structure at the Parousia. Vv. 14-15 describe a general testing of God's people. Just as God will test the builder's works (i.e., the Corinthian "living stones" who make up the structure) with fire, so too will he test the builders themselves. No one is immune from the testing fire, not even the workers. The phrase οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός serves as a reminder to the workers of this reality. Nevertheless, it is important to note that one survives the fire of the Parousia if they have faith in Christ. If one does not have enduring faith in Christ, neither worker nor work will survive the testing fire; they will both be consumed. Based on Paul's words elsewhere, this assumption is operative in the background of his words in vv. 14-15. It is only explicit in v. 14, when Paul acknowledges that not all work (i.e., people) will survive. Paul's focus on vv. 14-15 is to remind the workers that they too must pass through the same fire of judgment as their own works must do (οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός), even if they themselves will be saved if their faith is genuine.[128] If the work is consumed in the testing fires of the Parousia, then the workers will lose their wages. Thus, soteriology is based on faith, while eschatological reward depends on the quality of work. In light of the exegesis of vv. 14-15, it appears that the entire temple is composed of people, with both the workers and their human "works" subject to the same testing fire at the Lord's Day.

Just as Christian persons form the superstructure of this temple, Christ himself is part of this temple as its foundation, which further confirms that the entire temple is made up of persons and capable of being analyzed by Rabens' method. In v. 10, Paul describes his preaching as laying the foundation (θεμέλιον) to the Corinthian temple. He then identifies Christ as that foundation in v. 11. Note the differences in the principle verbs of

---

[128] See below with how this correlates with v. 17.

39

vv. 10-11. Paul ascribes agency to himself in the laying of the foundation in v. 10 while using a divine passive (the passive participle τὸν κείμενον) to describe the laying of the Christ-foundation in v. 11.[129] Moreover, Paul used the aorist active in v. 10 (ἔθηκα) and the present participle of κεῖμαι in v. 11.[130] Paul's action is complete, while God's action is in some sense still contemporary to the present time.[131] To me this suggests that v. 11 refers to a deeper reality: Christ's person and work as revealed in the "wisdom" of the cross. Previously in 1 Cor. Paul had used similar language to describe the cross as the community's foundation and the source of its power.[132] It was through the cross that Christ became for the community its wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption (1 Cor. 1:30). Thus, as Fee rightly notes, the foundation of the community is not doctrine or teaching. Christ's person is the foundation of the temple by virtue of his work. Christ's centrality to the temple structure becomes more evident when Paul writes in v. 11, "No one is able to lay another foundation with the exception of that which is laid (παρὰ τὸν κείμενον)." Through the comparative preposition παρά[133] Paul emphasizes the impossibility of building on any other foundation. Just as a single building must have a single foundation in order for it to be properly built, so too must the metaphorical temple-community have Jesus Christ as its only structure so that the construction progress might

---

[129] This important interplay of divine and human agency is central to my thesis. I will address this in chapter two.

[130] These observations have led some to criticize Paul for inconsistency or mixing his metaphors. See above. However, this misses Paul's point.

[131] Most commentators recognize the present tense, but then render it as a past tense in their paraphrases. Thiselton deviates from others and labels τὸν κείμενον as a perfect middle participle and then notes that this calls attention to "the "permanent effects of a past act" (310).

[132] Cf. 1 Cor. 1:17-19, 24; 2:5.

[133] Fee, 150.

continue. When the building's foundation ceases to be the person of Christ, then it ceases to be God's temple.[134] Christ, then, is as much (if not more) a part of God's temple as the Corinthians themselves. At this point, we now see that the metaphorical temple seems to be constituted by persons. Having established this point, we are now well-positioned for chapter two of this thesis, in which I will apply Volker Rabens' relational framework to the temple metaphor in order to show how it encapsulates the relationally-constituted Christian self.

In this section, I prepared for my use of Rabens' model in chapter two by noting that the metaphorical temple is composed of people. I made three observations by analyzing the structure of 3:9-17. First, ἔργον correlates with the people of the Corinthian congregation. Second, the building materials referred to the quality of the builder's workmanship. Third, the foundation refers to Christ. Having identified the three referents of the metaphorical temple, I concluded that the temple of 3:9-17 is composed of persons and thus fitting for an application of Rabens' relational model.

The Restricted Code of the Metaphorical Temple

Because there have been so few scholarly attempts to apply Douglas' structuralist approach to Paul's temple metaphor, I wish to establish three preliminary points to justify the use of Douglas' model in developing Paul's relational anthropology within the

---

[134] Interestingly, this compares favorably with Greek conceptions of sacred space. Petrovich and Petrovich describe how the Greeks described temples as τέμενος, or as a "separated" region. They write, "Effectively, the *temenos* represented an extension of the divine body." See Andrej Petrovic and Ivana Petrovic, *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion: Early Greek Religion* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016), 28-29. The divinity's (bodily?) presence rendered the space as sacred, and the temple was no longer an acceptable location for profane activities. See Robert Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1996), 31.

metaphor.[135] First, I will suggest that Paul's language in 3:1-17 and the rest of his epistle reflects a grid-strong environment in which ritual purity is symbolic restricted code.[136] Second, I will show that Paul's holiness language is precisely such restricted code which includes ritual purity. Third, I will examine the cosmological symbolism of the Jerusalem temple and suggest that it is applicable to Paul's metaphor. By making these three preliminary points I will then be prepared to apply Mary Douglas' structuralist approach in chapter three to show how Paul's temple metaphor emphasizes the horizontal and vertical relationships in his relational anthropology.

Because Douglas' methodology typically applies to an analysis of rituals, Paul's unconcern with ritual proper means that we need to examine Douglas' own criteria of language use to see if her model is applicable in this particular instance and therefore capable of properly highlight Paul's relational anthropology. Frequently in 3:1-17 and the rest of his epistle,[137] Paul describes the Corinthian congregation using language which suggests a grid-strong culture where the language of ritual purity expresses significant meaning in condensed forms of expression. In 3:1-17, Paul uses the idea of divine ownership to remind the Corinthians of their responsibility to God. In v. 8 he places the genitive θεοῦ in the emphatic position three times in a row (θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί, θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε).[138] This emphasizes the reality of God's authority

---

[135] See my discussion regarding this lack of scholarly treatment in chapter 3 of this thesis.

[136] See my methodology section in chapter one for these definitions.

[137] This is especially true in 1 Cor. 13-14. This particular passage reflects Douglas' understanding of a grid-strong environment that discourages enthusiastic displays of worship. See Stephen C. Barton, "Paul's Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth," *New Testament Studies* 32, no. 2 (1986): 225-246.

[138] Fee, 144.

over the Corinthians. Moreover, the Corinthians are both builders and stewards who receive their wages from God (3:14-15; 4:1-5). Failure to faithfully build and steward well results in the decrease of one's wages. Above all, the temple (constituted by the living stones of Corinthian persons) belongs to God (3:16-17). Finally, Paul reminds his readers that God observes every person's thoughts (vv. 18-19) and that the entire community belongs to Christ, who in turn belongs to God (v. 23). These examples of divine ownership and human responsibility to both God and man is grid-strong language which finds expression in Paul's ethical recommendations to the church. In chapter 5, Paul pronounces judgment on a sexual deviant within the church. In so doing, he reminds the Corinthians of the corrupting influences of a sinner within the congregation (5:6-8) and recommends purging the evil person from their midst (5:13). Taken together, this grid-strong environment means that any Pauline use of ritual purity and holiness language might well be examples of symbolic ritual code and if so meet the conditions of Douglas' structuralist approach to ritual purity, thus helping us bring out Paul's anthropology in the metaphor.

When we turn to 3:16-17, we find that Paul's holiness language is indeed restricted symbolic code referencing symbolic ritual purity and therefore open to Douglas' anthropological insights. As noted above, Paul is taking an innovative approach on temple symbolism in labeling the community as God's temple. In vv. 10-15, Paul slowly builds up his temple metaphor before the rhetorical climax in vv. 16-17. It is precisely because his readers were culturally-trained to view temples as holy that he can

assume this point while developing the idea of community-as-temple.[139] For Hellenized audiences (both Gentile and Jewish) who understood temple rituals as highly-controlled forms of communication[140] with the divine,[141] such proximity to the divine and contact with holiness in the temple precinct necessitated ritual purity.[142] Therefore, in v. 17 holiness (ἅγιός) is Paul's assumed point of metaphorical contact between the Jerusalem temple and the Corinthian community. Paul does not have to make this explicit. This unstated assumption helps explain how the holiness of the temple-community relates to God's judgment in v. 17. Rather than this being an example of Käsemann's "sentence of holy law,"[143] v. 17 explains how one would expect God to respond to the defilement of his temple.[144] The verb φθείρω can even mean "defile" under the right conditions.[145] According to Liu, community division in a cultic community was widely understood as

---

[139] Parker, 31. He notes that Hellenistic religious thinkers understood holiness to exist on a spectrum of holy-profane-polluted, citing a list of Cyrene purity regulations to prove that this is more than an "analyst's abstraction." For the relevant epigraphic evidence, see CGRN 99, lines A20-25. See also Liu, 33-105.

[140] Douglas, *Natural Symbols*, 22.

[141] Angelos Chaniotis studied so-called "confession tablets" in Roman Asia Minor. His work demonstrates that the Roman and the Hellenistic world broadly conceived of rituals as communication with the gods, in which the supplicant acknowledges divine power by adhering to the purity requirements of the ritual. Both the inward disposition of the supplicant and the outward observance of ritual purity mattered in the context of these rituals. See Angelos Chaniotis, "Ritual Performances of Divine Justice: The Epigraphy of Confession, Atonement and Exaltation in Roman Asia Minor," in *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, eds. Hannah M. Cotton, Robert G. Hoyland, Jonathan J. Price, and David J. Wasserstein (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 115-153; "Under the Watchful Eyes of the Gods: Divine Justice in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor," in *The Greco-Roman East: Politics, Culture, Society*, ed. Stephen Colvin (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1-43.

[142] Klawans, *Impurity*, 25.

[143] Ernst Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today*, trans. W. J. Montague (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), 65-81.

[144] Cf. Lev. 10:1-3; 1 Sam. 2:27-36; 2 Sam. 6:5-15.

[145] BDAG, 1054; LSJ, 306.

ritually-defiling, pointing to the parallels in Num. 16 (LXX) and 1 Cor. 3:16-17.[146] In

light of this, φθείρω bears the undertones of ritual impurity. The reality of ritual purity is

inseparable from the idea of a temple, and this appears to be equally true within Paul's

metaphor as he applies the temple comparison to the ethical life of the community.[147] In

light of this, Paul's metaphor bears significant cultural meaning and can be properly

described as restricted symbolic code capable worthy of an application of Douglas'

anthropological approach.

     Not only is Paul using temple purity as a symbol within his metaphor, he is

drawing upon contemporary conversation about the cosmological significance of the

Jerusalem temple (and the divine presence there) and applying those conclusions to the

Corinthian community in a way that heightens the danger of close proximity to the divine

(a particularly important point for Douglas' structuralist methodology). This intramural

Jewish conversation is worth pursuing here in some depth, as many commentators have

anachronistically claimed that Paul is spiritualizing the Christian community as an

apocalyptic community and replacing the Jerusalem temple.[148] Taking cues from such

verses as Ex. 25:40 and Ps. 11:14,[149] Jewish writers regularly spoke of the Jerusalem

temple as a copy of a heavenly reality and as such viewed its architectural features and

---

[146] Liu, 124-127. This is a strong argument in light of the broader theme of 1 Cor. 3.

[147] This is often overlooked by those who argue that Paul envisions a purely ethical holiness rather than a ritual purity (cf. Fee, 161). Given the function of ritual purity in the ancient Mediterranean, it is impossible to separate ritual purity from ethical holiness. See Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan, "Introduction," in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, eds. Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), 20.

[148] Conzelmann summarizes this position well when he writes, "Paul is alluding to the apocalyptic expectation of the last days and spiritualizes [the temple]" (Conzelmann, 77). See also Barrett, 90; Gärtner, 57-58; Newton, 53. For a critique, see Hogeterp, 3-8. See chapter three for more detail.

[149] Barton, "The Jerusalem Temple," 357. For one example, see Josephus, *Ant*. 3.123, 132, 146, 180-187.

cultic components as having cosmological symbolism.[150] Davies notes that within Jewish

circles at the turn of the century, the Jerusalem temple was widely understood as the

meeting place between heaven and earth, resulting in "a cosmological duality

characterized by the permeation of boundaries."[151] This "permeation" is most clearly seen

in Jewish apocalyptic literature, where the authors see the activities of the earthly temple

as joining in with the activities of the heavenly reality. Davies has demonstrated that 1

Enoch exemplifies this. Like Josephus, the author of Enoch encounters a tripartite heaven

that reflects the tripartite temple, where he encounters God's glory upon a lofty throne in

the heavenly holy of holies.[152] This "Temple-shaped" heaven defies physics, where the

holy of holies dwarfs the size of the other chambers.[153] Additionally, the cosmos itself is

three-tiered, divided into Sheol, Earth, and Heaven.[154] Enoch sees a mountain ascending

from earth into heaven in 17:2 (thus indicating that earth and heaven are connected), and

later in 25:3 the angel tells Enoch, "This high mountain that you saw, whose peak is like

the throne of God, is the seat where the Great Holy One, the Lord of glory, the King of

eternity, will sit, when he descends to visit the earth in goodness."[155] This statement,

when read in conjunction with the heavenly ascent in *1 Enoch* 14-15, suggests that this

---

[150] Klawans, *Impurity*, 114-123.

[151] James P. Davies, *Paul Among the Apocalypses?: An Evaluation of the 'Apocalyptic Paul' in the Context of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Literature* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 124. Cf. Beale, 333. Beale notes that this "likely gave rise to the notion that Israel was the 'middle (or navel) of the earth." He points to Ezek. 5:5; 3812; *Jubilees* 8:12, 19; *1 Enoch* 26:1-4.

[152] Davies, 125-126; *1 En*. 14:8-20.

[153] Ibid, 123-124.

[154] Ibid, 120.

[155] George W. E. Nicklesburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*, ed. Klaus Baltzer, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001), 312.

mountain is the Jerusalem temple, with the meeting of heaven and earth occurring at the footstool (the earthly holy of holies) of God's throne room.[156] Thus, this cosmological symbolism was native to contemporary understandings of the Jerusalem temple, and at the same time indicated a porous boundary between heaven and earth at the Holy of Holies. How does this apply to Paul? Paul understands Christ to be the foundation of the Corinthian temple (3:10-11) by being the Corinthians' righteousness, sanctification, and redemption (1:30). At the same time, Paul understands Christ to be located in heaven in God's presence.[157] By comparing the church to the Holy of Holies and confessing that God is present in the Corinthian temple (3:16), Paul is locating the permeable boundary between earth and heaven within the Christian community. It is within the Christian community that the wisdom of heaven is experienced here on earth, and in which the Christian can experience something of the divine order of the eschatological age. I will develop this argument more clearly in chapter two after applying Rabens' framework. For now, suffice it to say that Paul's holiness language in the grid-strong environment of ancient Corinth complements the cosmological symbolism of the Jerusalem temple. We are now ready to apply Douglas' structuralist approach to purity language in chapter three having noted the cosmological significance of the temple metaphor and the proximity of the congregation to the divine.

In this third section, I prepared to use Douglas' approach by arguing that Paul's temple symbolism meets Douglas' own prerequisites for using her model. I accomplished this in two points. First, I proposed that Paul's language reflects a grid-strong

---

[156] Davies, 124. Cf. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 131.

[157] Rom. 8:34.

environment in which symbols condense language and convey a significant amount of coded information. Second, I posited that reading the holiness language and cosmological significance of vv. 16-17 into vv. 9-15 will highlight the passage's anthropological ramifications. By showing how Paul's temple metaphor fits Douglas' structuralist requirements, I will be able to employ her model to Paul's relational anthropology.

Conclusion

In chapter one of this thesis, I prepared to discuss how Paul's temple metaphor illustrates his relational understanding of the Christian self by clarifying the context of his building referent. Section one examined how the theme of Christian growth united the two structures of the building metaphor in 3:1-17. Likewise, I posited that Paul's construction language indicates the Jerusalem temple as the most likely referent. I proceeded to propose in section two that the Corinthian temple is constituted by the persons of Christ and the Corinthian Christians, with God's Spirit relationally-present amid the temple people. As such, Rabens' pneumatic relational model for ethical transformation is well-suited to bring out the network of relationships within this metaphorical temple. This will help us see in chapter two that Paul understands the Christian self as relationally constituted in Christ through the Holy Spirit.

In the second section of this first chapter, I argued that Paul's temple metaphor lends itself well to Douglas' structuralist reading which highlight the relational constitution of the Christian self. Paul's grid-strong environment would understand Paul's cultic metaphor as part of a larger symbolic framework. Paul's holiness language specifically invokes this ritual symbolic framework, and God's presence in the Corinthian temple likewise invokes the widely-understood cosmological symbolism of the Jerusalem

48

temple. In light of this, I propose that we have the prerequisites for applying Douglas'

structuralist approach to purity language. This model applied in chapter three will help us

see precisely how Paul's temple metaphor describes a divinely-ordered self made

possible through Spirit-constituted relationships.

Chapter 2: Applying Rabens' Framework to the Temple Metaphor

Chapter Summary

How does the self relate to other persons? This is my guiding questions in this section. In this chapter, I will begin highlighting Paul's understanding of the relationally constituted self as it is found in the temple metaphor of 1 Cor. 3:9-17. Having clarified the context of the metaphor's referents in chapter one, I will now analyze the metaphor using Rabens' relational model for religious-ethical empowerment by the work of the Spirit. I will show in the first section how the self is constituted in relationships. In the second section I will argue that the self exists on an apocalyptic-relational spectrum and is necessarily brought to completion at the eschaton through relationships. Through these two points, I will conclude that Paul's temple metaphor demonstrates a relational understanding of the self's constitution.

The State of Scholarship: Entering the Discussion

The widespread debate as to the function of Paul's temple metaphor within the Corinthian correspondence merits an application of Rabens' framework in order to clear a path forward in our understanding of Paul's thought. First, there is the old yet influential thesis that Paul is labeling the Corinthian congregation as a spiritual substitute to the material temple cult in Jerusalem as a consequence of Christ's sacrifice.[158] This has influenced many different takes on Paul's use of the temple metaphor, with scholars

---

[158] The originator of this thesis is Hans Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament* (Leipzig, DE: E. Pfeiffer, 1932), *passim*.

engaging at various levels with the idea of the Christian community being the fulfilled eschatological temple[159] or as a quasi-Qumran group.[160] Some scholars such as Klinzig and Strack nuanced this category and instead suggest that Paul was reinterpreting the temple cult for his Gentile audience[161] or giving a typological interpretation of the Jerusalem temple.[162] Recently, some scholars have noted that Paul at times seems to have a positive view of the temple and therefore his temple metaphor may actually serve to include the Gentiles within the Jerusalem cult.[163] However, in contemporary scholarship the majority understand the temple metaphor as a largely rhetorical tool which serves to combat partisanship and to encourage ethical living in the Corinthian community.[164] One of the points of debate which these groups share in common is the importance of the divine presence (God's Spirit) to Paul's temple metaphor. As such, Rabens' model offers a path forward in this debate. By demonstrating that Paul does not imagine God's Spirit

---

[159] Conzelmann, 77; Gärtner, 102-103; McKelvey, 58. See chapter one of this thesis.

[160] Newman, 52-60. Newman argues that the writings of Paul and the Qumran texts are the only two sources in the ancient world which identify a community as a temple rather than a building. As such, Newton believes that the Qumran texts ought to be used to interpret Paul (especially with regards to Paul's purity language). This is a problematic assumption which I address below.

[161] George Klinzig, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT*, (Göttingen, DE: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), *passim*.

[162] Strack, 69-70.

[163] Fredricksen, "Judaizing the Nations," 248-250; Horn, "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel," 196-199. These two scholars understand early Christian rituals to be roughly equivalent to those taking place in the Jerusalem temple. They interpret Paul within Judaism and understand his writings as further expression of Second-Temple Judaism (as opposed to an initial parting of ways between the Christian and Jewish traditions).

[164] Barton, "The Jerusalem Temple," 372-375; Hogeterp, 295-331; Lanci, 115-138; Liu, 114-127; Eyal Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2019), 57-68; Wardle, 210-214.

as material,[165] Rabens has opened a new avenue of engaging with the temple metaphor and the divine presence within the Corinthian community. Moreover, by showing that the Spirit ethically transforms and empowers Christians by means of relationships, Rabens offers a means of bridging the gap between ethical/rhetorical interpretations of Paul's temple metaphor and ecclesiological/sacrificial interpretations of Paul's rhetoric.[166] In light of the potential for this model to offer new insights to a widely-debated image, I will be applying Rabens' model to Paul's temple metaphor.

Nevertheless, my primary aim in this chapter is not to resolve the divide between the ethical/rhetorical interpretation and the ecclesiological/sacrificial interpretation; rather, I will be engaging those who address the anthropological aspects of Paul's thought in the Corinthian correspondence. Because most exegetical treatments of the temple metaphor in 3:9-17 do not engage what I believe to be its anthropological consequences (due to the issues discussed above),[167] I will turn to those who do see its anthropological consequences even if their own exegetical engagement of 3:9-17 is limited. Engberg-Pedersen and Martin are two of my central dialogue partners. In their works, they note the correlation between Paul's body language and his temple metaphor and therefore directly engage with the temple in 1 Corinthians and how this image relates to his anthropology.[168] They argue that Paul's temple metaphors demonstrate an anthropological ontology of substance, with Martin arguing that Paul's substance

---

[165] Rabens, 25-120.

[166] Ibid, 123-242.

[167] A notable exception is Weissenrieder, 377-411.

[168] Engberg-Pedersen, 169-171; Martin, 163-179. Notably, Martin does not engage with the temple metaphor of 1 Cor. 3:9-17.

ontology reflects the milieu of the cosmology of popular science in the eastern Greco-Roman world.[169] Engberg-Pedersen similarly argues that Paul's substance ontology bear striking similarities to Stoic cosmological principles.[170] Rabens' relational model, on the other hand, brings together in Paul an ontology of relationship and an ontology of substance.[171] Rabens himself does not directly engage the temple metaphor of 3:9-17, so this chapter will be a continuation of his exegetical method. Additionally, because the relational anthropologies of Käsemann and Eastman do not interact with the temple metaphor of 3:9-17, they are in the background rather than the foreground of my examination of this particular metaphor.[172]

Plan for this Chapter

Having proposed in chapter one that Paul's extended metaphor (3:9-17) depicts God's temple as composed of persons, I will now apply to the pericope Rabens' pneumatic-relational model for ethical empowerment. Application of Rabens' model to the complex relational dynamics within the metaphor will demonstrate that Paul's anthropology centers around relationships. Even while Paul assumes the existence of an individuated self, the force of his rhetoric and imagery show that he understands the Christian self as being initiated, maintained, and brought to completion at the eschaton by the interplay of divine and human relationships.

---

[169] Martin, 3-37.

[170] Engberg-Pedersen, 175-182. His reasoning is far more complex and gives significant weight to the cognitive element of Paul's language.

[171] Rabens, 138-144.

[172] Eastman, *passim*; Käsemann, "On Paul's Anthropology," 1-31.

In the first section of this chapter, I will employ Rabens' model to the metaphor of Christ as the temple's foundation in order to argue that the Christ-relationship forms the self. I will do this in three ways. First, I will examine how the community is united in Christ. I will argue that Paul presents God's power and wisdom as meeting together in the person of Christ, who himself disrupts the world's wisdom. Through analysis of Paul's use of καλέω, I will further contend that the Christ-foundation of the temple implies that the community is one of new creation, in which both the individuals and the community have been given life by God's creative power in Christ. As such, Christ's person binds the community together into unity, to the degree that "temple" is one of the best ways to describe Christian oneness. Second, I will look at how God's Spirit fits into this relational network. I will do so by using Rabens' model to show that Paul understands this Christocentric unity as accessible only through a Spirit-generated relationship with Christ: the Spirit binds believers to Christ and subsequently to one another. Third, I will show how the Spirit-generated Christ-relationship(s) fundamentally alters the Corinthian sense of self and therefore reorient one's relationship to others and the world. This will enable me to engage both with scholars who suggest that Paul's thought leaves little room for the individual and with those who criticize the concept of the relational self for similar reasons. I will suggest that Paul's imagery presupposes an individual self even if it is not in western Cartesian terms. Rather, Paul depicts an individual who is open to and deeply affected by Spirit-generated relationships. I will conclude that the best way to speak of Paul's understanding of the self is to speak of it as relationally-constituted with other believers in Christ.

In the second section of this chapter, I will apply Rabens' model to Paul's image of an incomplete temple in order to argue that the Christian self is in a continuous state of construction brought to eschatological completion through relationships. I will make three points in this section. First, I will propose that Paul breaks from widely-understood notions of temples by describing the metaphorical temple as incomplete yet still filled with the divine presence. By analyzing the concept of oneness projected upon the Jerusalem temple, I will show that the interplay of divine grace and human agency within the image of an incomplete temple reflects Paul's belief that God is at work through human agents in the process of building up both individuals and the community. Just as the temple awaits the Parousia for its completion, so too must the individual. From this I will argue in my second point that the Christian self exists on an apocalyptic spectrum, in which one end represents the "nothingness" of sin and the other end represents full maturity in Christlikeness and new creation. Where the self sits upon the spectrum depends on its relationship with apocalyptic powers and humans. Moreover, in my third point, I propose that the enduring identity of the eschatological self is deeply shaped by both divine and human relationships. I will conclude that the dividing line between the individual and others is often quite blurred while never being completely destroyed. By applying Rabens' relational model for ethical empowerment to Paul's metaphor of an incomplete temple, I will conclude that the Christian self reaches its eschatological fulfillment only through divine agency, while growing in this life through the relational interplay of divine grace and human agency.

Christ as the Foundation of the Temple

In this section, I will examine the relational implications for Paul's anthropology in his depiction of Christ as the temple's foundation. By using Rabens' pneumatic-relational model, I will conclude that Paul's relational anthropology is fundamentally Christocentric. In this section, I will make two points. First, I will argue that individuals receive God's power and wisdom from Christ through a Spirit-enabled relationship. Second, I will contend that the temple community is one of new creation, in which individuals are transformed in the image of Christ through relationships. These two points will enable me to argue that the self is reshaped in the Christ-relationship.

Because Paul locates Christ's person as the temple's one foundation, we need to briefly engage with the manner in which Paul presents the Christ event in the leadup to his metaphor and how that presentation reveals a Christocentric anthropology in 3:9-17, which will allow me to focus upon the Christocentric nature of Paul's anthropology. Earlier in 1 Corinthians, Paul consistently focuses on the centrality of Christ for the community. Paul had earlier (in 1:24) described Christ as both "the power of God and the wisdom of God," using the emphatic genitive phrases θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν. It is in Christ's person where we encounter the union of God's wisdom and power. As a result, when we encounter solo references either to God's wisdom or God's power in 1 Corinthians, we should understand them as one and the same by virtue of Christ's person.[173] Because Christ himself is both God's wisdom and God's power, the cross becomes an instrument to save mankind through Christ's death (1:18, 30) even though it lacks the appearance of either. The wisdom of the world and its power on the

---

[173] The parallelism in 1:25 reinforces this conclusion.

other hand leads to death for all those who adhere to it on account of its opposition to God (1:19, 2:16). When judgment and destruction come on the day of the Parousia, Christ will sustain all those who are in the community (κοινωνίαν) established by him (1:8-9). By describing Jesus Christ as the temple's only foundation, Paul seems to be engaging in Jewish temple discourse in which the Jerusalem temple symbolized God's power.[174] Thus, since Paul's presentation of Christ in 1 Cor. 1-3 shapes how we read Christ in the temple metaphor, we can say that the temple of God is a result of the person and work of Christ Jesus, who himself is the disruptive power and wisdom of God.

Because Christ's person and work sits at the heart of the temple metaphor, we need to engage with Paul's understanding of the Christian as a new creation because it is implicated both by the Christocentric temple and by the expectation of the Parousia; only then can we appreciate how Christ (as God's disruptive wisdom and power) is at the heart of Paul's relational anthropology. I have two main points on this theme. First, we see the Christian as a new creation via the occurrences of καλέω in passages leading up to 3:1-17. In that section Paul situates God's life-giving call within a communal context.[175] He

---

[174] Stevenson, 157-167. Stevenson's analysis is helpful here, especially his discussion surrounding the situation in Corinth. According to Stevenson, pagan temples also represented divine power. Consider the temple to Aphrodite in Corinth. Classical writers regularly refer to Aphrodite as the protectress of her Corinthian city. For example, Euripides (as preserved by Strabo) refers to Corinth as "the sacred hill-city of Aphrodite (ἱερὸν ὄχθον, πόλιν Ἀφροδίτας)" (Strabo 8.6.21). During the Greco-Persian Wars, Corinthian citizens attributed the salvation of their city specifically to Aphrodite and posted a dedication in her temple listing the names of the prostitutes who prayed on the city's behalf (Athenaeus 13.573-4). This civic identification with Aphrodite endured into the Roman era. Pausanias writes that Aphrodite is depicted as armed within her temple on the Acrocorinth (Pausanius 2.5.1), and Lanci notes that the temple of Aphrodite "became one of the most enduring motifs for Roman Corinthian coinage" (Lanci, 95-99).

[175] For a detailed study of the various nuances in Paul's use of καλέω in 1 Corinthians, see Stephen J. Chester, *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church*, 2nd ed. (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 59-112. Chester persuasively argues that even while Paul's use of καλέω may reflect multiple distinct uses they are all grounded in the idea that God's call upon the individual is a life-giving call. It reflects something of God as the one who creates *ex nihilo*.

initially alludes to this reality in 1:2 and 1:9, in which he describes how God calls his

holy ones in Christ into a trans-local community. He describes this community as an

assembly (1:2) and a fellowship (1:9). Yet it is in 1:26-31 that Paul most clearly engages

the communal implications of God's life-giving call in Christ. While meditating on the

contrast between the power and wisdom of God as found in Jesus Christ, Paul asks the

Corinthians to self-reflect by considering the circumstances of their own calling (τὴν

κλῆσιν ὑμῶν). He reminds his readers of their low status in Corinthian society and how

God has chosen what is weak and foolish in the world as opposed to the strong and the

wise.[176] Paul uses the curious phrase τὰ μὴ ὄντα in opposition to τὰ ὄντα in describing

how God chose the lowly and despised in 1:28. Commentators often see these phrases as

suggestive of social realities only (as opposed to the cosmological meaning in Rom. 4:17)

and translate τὰ μὴ ὄντα as "the nothings/have-nots" and τὰ ὄντα as "the

somethings/haves."[177] However, Chester suggests that both Rom. 4:17 and 1 Cor. 1:28

express an identical reality, namely that of the God who creates *ex nihilo* on the basis of

his divine call.[178] Chester justifies this reading by noting that the two passages have

identical constructions and both of them have occurrences of καλέω. Thus, we should

translate τὰ μὴ ὄντα as "the things that are not" and τὰ ὄντα as "the things that are." This

translation brings to the fore the reality of divine act of new creation in bringing the

---

[176] However, Theissen has demonstrated that there apparently were some in the congregation who were of high status (Theissen, 69-119).

[177] Ciampa and Rosner, 105-107; Collins, 111; Fee, 87; Garland, 75-77; Thiselton, 183-186. Cf. Barrett, 28-29; Fitzmyer, 163; Robertson and Plummer, 23-24.

[178] Chester, 77-81.

58

individual to faith,[179] without blurring the social realities already evident in 1 Cor. 1:28.

God mirrors the upside-down reality of the cross by manifesting his act of new creation

in those of low social status in direct contradiction to the wisdom of worldly social

status.[180] Through the cross of Christ, non-being is brought by God into being. That

which currently has being, on the other hand, will be brought into non-being through the

very instrument (Christ) which has the capacity to create *ex nihilo*. For this reason, Paul

considers rivalry and dissension to be equivalent to death and therefore opposed to the

community of new creation (2:6). He subsequently forbids boasting (1:30-31) as behavior

opposed to the life within the Christian community. Second, this dynamic reveals itself

within the temple metaphor of 3:9-17. To labor as one who experiences God's new

creation is to labor in humility. On the other hand, those who boast and sow division

through worldly behavior do not reflect their life-giving calling and lack growth in this

life (3:1-5). These laborers reflect that which will be brought into non-being. Their

contributions to the temple structure will be consumed at the Parousia, for only that

which is rooted in the wisdom and power of Christ will survive (3:15). Paul emphasizes

again in 3:17 that God will destroy those who build upon his temple with tools that are

opposed to God's creative intent for his temple.[181] Because Christ is the source of power

---

[179] The phrase I render "new creation" comes from two places in Paul's letters: 2 Cor. 5:17 (ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις) and Gal 6:15 (οὔτε γὰρ περιτομή τί ἐστιν οὔτε ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις). There is debate as to whether καινὴ κτίσις means "new creation" or "new creature." Hubbard argues that the phrase should be translated as "new creature," arguing that Paul is primarily concerned with the anthropological aspect of the gospel in these passages rather than with the cosmological [Moyer V. Hubbard, *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought* (Cambridge:, UK Cambridge University Press, 2002), 183-186]. Moo argues the exact reverse: Paul's anthropological concerns flows from his cosmological perspective [Douglas J. Moo, "Creation and New Creation," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 20, no. 1 (2010): 39-60. I concur with Moo. Cf. Barclay, *The Gift*, 394-396.

[180] Ibid, 79.

[181] For the allusions to community division in 3:17, see Liu, 124-127.

and wisdom for God's temple, the Christians who form that temple are new creations only by virtue of being built upon the Christ foundation.[182] The self as a new creation flows out of the transformative Christ relationship.

Therefore, the metaphor of Christ as the temple foundation refers not simply to the gospel message,[183] nor is it only a rhetorical device[184] - it depicts Christ himself as the relational lynchpin of the self-in-community. This Christ relationship is so powerful and transformative that it has the ability to constitute an entire community of new creations bound together in relational unity, and this relational dynamic is reflected in Paul's temple metaphor. The image of the temple's sole foundation being Christ (3:10-11), who as the source of new creation gives unity to the community, is crucial to the metaphor and to the entire epistle in general. I will make one point in this paragraph, namely that because Paul understands the person of Christ to be the source of the temple's life by virtue of his being the wisdom and power of God. As such, Paul understands communal unity to also flow from Christ. I have already noted in chapter one of this thesis how in 3:10 the act of foundation-laying refers to Paul's first preaching the gospel in Corinth, while in 3:11 the once-and-for-all foundation-laying refers to God's act to save his people through the Christ event. I also noted in chapter one how Paul writes in 3:10-11 on the theme of unity flowing out of Christian growth, as opposed to the lack of growth evidenced by the Corinthian schisms (3:1-4). We see in 3:10 that all construction toward growth and unity has its basis in Christ. However, in order to see precisely how this fits

---

[182] Cf. Weissenrieder, 411.

[183] Fitzmyer, 198.

[184] Weissenrieder, 404.

into Paul's metaphor, we must return to the letter's πρόθεσις, or the letter's central appeal.[185] In 1:10, Paul writes his appeal for Corinthian unity that characterizes the entire epistle: "But I appeal to you, brethren, through (διὰ) the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, in order that you might speak all things in the same way and that there might not be schisms among you, but that you might be complete (κατηρτισμένοι) in the same mind (νοῒ) and in the same judgment." I will make three subpoints regarding 1:10. First, this instrumental gloss of διά demonstrates that Paul rests his appeal upon the authoritative name of Christ; it is through Christ that he asks the community to be unified.[186] Second, καταρτίζω reflects the notion of something incomplete or unsuitable for a particular purpose and therefore requires either restoration or preparation; it is ethical in orientation.[187] Third, Paul desires that the Corinthians be of the same mind (νοῦς) and judgment. Paul will later crystalize this image of one mind in 2:16 when he writes, "We have the mind of Christ (νοῦν Χριστοῦ)." Despite the parallelism of νοῦς / γνώμη in 1:10, it is unlikely that either 1:10 or 2:16 refer to the Stoic idea of the monistic rationality of the universe.[188] The context of 1 Cor. 1:10-17 suggests instead that νοῦς refers to perceptive faculties and one's means of understanding.[189] In v. 11, Paul describes the divisions in Corinth as "quarreling (ἔρις)." Dividing themselves into different parties, the

---

[185] Mitchell argues persuasively that 1:10 serves as the πρόθεσις of 1 Cor (Mitchell, 1).

[186] Wallace, 368-369. Note the close semantic overlap between διά as expressing agency and διά as expressing means. In 1:10, there is a close overlap between divine and human agency that Paul will bring out in more detail within the temple metaphor itself. See below my discussion of the dynamics of agency in 1 Cor. 3:9-17.

[187] BDAG, 526; LSG, 910.

[188] Cf. Martin, 63; Engeberg-Pederson, 80, 83. For fuller argument against understanding νοῦς as a reference to Stoic principles, Rabens, 86-96; Richards, 104.

[189] Fee, 126. See below for more details.

Corinthians are quarreling with one another concerning the implications of the Christ event.[190] However, as Chester's work shows, what the Corinthians perceive as being logical conclusions of the Christ event owe more to their social location than to the reality of the cross.[191] For Paul, the cross of Christ has the power to unite by virtue of its opposition to the world's wisdom (1:17). Because the Corinthians do not perceive the contradiction between the wisdom of the world and the wisdom of the cross, Paul spends twenty nine verses (1:18-2:16) in demonstrating this contrast, ending this section with the words, "We have the mind of Christ." Paul exhorts the Corinthians in 1:10 to be complete (κατηρτισμένοι) in the mind of Christ precisely because it situates their world through the light of the cross. This will result in an ethical change in the Corinthian community and will heal communal divisions.[192] Paul finds the resulting unity in Christ so powerful that he moves from calling the Corinthians a "fellowship" (κοινωνίαν) in 1:9 to a "temple" in 3:9-17, since temples were widely understood as symbols of oneness.[193] Because Christ the temple-foundation is not divided (v. 13), the community draws its temple-like unity from him. As I continue to trace Paul's relational anthropology within his temple

---

[190] Through the various Corinthian slogans within the epistle, we can see the different conclusions that the congregation drew.

[191] See Chester, 213-316.

[192] Indeed, Paul applies this broader point to particular ethical dilemmas in the congregation in 1 Cor. 5-14.

[193] Chester argues that the Corinthian congregation may have understood themselves as analogous to a cultic voluntary association (Chester, 227-266). Thus, when Paul uses temple-language to describe this fellowship, he is employing strong cultural symbolism to reinterpret the ramifications of the Christ event for the Corinthians. In Greece, the temple came to be seen as a common institution (κοινόν) (Stevenson, 55). This was such a widespread notion that Theophrastus used it in his will to describe how his property should be shared jointly with his friends; his friends were to "hold it like a temple in joint possession (ὡς ἂν ἱερὸν κοινῇ κεκτημένοις)" (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.53).

metaphor, we begin to see hints that it is Christocentric in orientation as demonstrated by the image of Christ as the temple's sole foundation.

The application of Rabens' framework to Paul's Christ-as-foundation imagery further highlights that God's Spirit is the relational instrument through which God's people gain access to Christ and undergo ethical transformation, further highlighting the relational constitution of the Christian self. In chapter one of this thesis, I noted the cosmological implications of 3:16 in which Paul metaphorically locates the permeable boundary between heaven and earth within the Corinthian community. The presence of God's Spirit in the temple community bridges the divide between heaven and earth and allows God's people to access Christ's person. This cosmological reality brings forward into the temple metaphor some of Paul's conclusions from 1 Cor. 2:10-16.[194] In 2:10-16, Paul attributes the Christian's ability to understand the wisdom of the cross to God's Spirit. He makes this attribution because only God's Spirit understands God's deepest thoughts (v. 11). However, precisely because God's Spirit abides with Christians and personally teaches them (ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος) spiritual truths (v. 12-13), the Christian's perceptive faculties are capable of understanding the wisdom of the Christ event. Through the connective γάρ in v. 11, Paul grounds his teaching in Is. 40:13 (LXX). The context of Isaiah 40 shows God redeeming Israel from their sins, announcing the

---

[194] This passage is famous for its exegetical challenges and its ramifications for Paul's anthropology. While Rabens' model is helpful in resolving these tensions, he himself does not exegete 2:10-16. Showing the applicability of this model myself takes me too far afield from the central task of this thesis, namely the demonstration of how Paul's temple metaphor frames his relational anthropology. Therefore, in this thesis I will assume the fittingness of Rabens' model for the exegetical challenges of 2:10-16. For an exegetical approach to this passage which bears close resemblance to Rabens' model, see Craig S. Keener, *The Mind of the Spirit: Paul's Approach to Transformed Thinking* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016), 173-199. See also Ciampa and Rosner, 128-139; Garland, 198-103; Thiselton, 254-286. Cf. Fee, 115-129; Fitzmyer, 179-188; Martin, 61-63.

good news of their redemption, and declaring how no one is powerful to save like the God of Israel. In v. 13, the prophet demonstrates this by rhetorically asking, "Who knows the mind of the Lord; and who has become his counselor who instructs him (τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο, ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτον)?" Where the Hebrew originally says רוח יהוה (the Spirit of the LORD), the translator of the LXX chose νοῦν κυρίου (mind of the Lord).[195] Paul then makes a further change in substituting the "mind of the Lord" for "mind of Christ." Paul's substitution is critical in two ways. First, he uses νοῦς to signify the instrument of understanding (Christ) rather than the organ of thought (the brain).[196] Paul's focus is relationally-generated perception. Second, as Thiselton observes, Paul equates the "Spirit of God" with "the mind of the Lord" through this quote.[197] Thus, "the Spirit-led person" (πνευματικός)[198] perceives through the Spirit of God / the mind of Christ while "the merely-living person" (ψυχικός) lacks this perceptive agent and is consequentially blind to the upside-down nature of God's ethics.[199] We ought to read this πνευματικός- ψυχικός dynamic in the temple metaphor itself, as Paul brackets the passage (3:1-8, 18-23) with contrasts between behavior stemming from worldly wisdom and behavior stemming from godly wisdom. Because the

---

[195] Witherington writes, "Obviously these terms were interchangeable to the Septuagint translator" (129).

[196] Thiselton, 275.

[197] Ibid.

[198] Cf. Williams, 230-235. He argues that πνευματικός should be translated as "one characterized by the Spirit." While I am sympathetic to this translation, it does not quite capture the relational dynamics of this particular characterization elicited by Rabens' model.

[199] John M. G. Barclay, "Πνευματικός in the Social Dialect of Pauline Christianity," in *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016), 205-216.; Birger Albert Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism* (Missoula, MT: Scholar's Press, 1973), 40-42.

Spirit is relationally-present in the midst of the temple-people giving them the mind of Christ, the workers are able to build upon the Christ-foundation. They perceive how the cross of Christ brings personal prestige and competition to an end. Thus, in ministry to other "living stones," Christians build one another up rather than tear each other down. By applying Rabens' relational model to the verses preceding Paul's temple metaphor, we are able to see that God's temple-people, called by God into being from non-being, are able to properly engage in building up one another because they have Christ's mind by virtue of a Spirit-created relationship with Christ. In other words, the Christian self's ethical empowerment and transformation occurs via relationships.

The juxtaposition of God's life-giving call to Christians with the threat of communal disunity sheds important light upon Paul's relational anthropology in light of recent claims about ancient understandings of the self, and I will make two points in this regard. Martin has popularized the idea that Paul thinks like an ancient Greek or Roman and subsequently has little concept of the individual, since that which composes the self is in essential continuity with the surrounding world.[200] Engberg-Pedersen is sympathetic to Martin's presentation,[201] but he ostensibly makes room for the self in his presentation of Paul's anthropology.[202] However, because he interprets the pneuma as material, the

---

[200] This is a shocking and radical claim that sets Martin apart from mainline scholarship. However, he is quite clear on this point. He writes of the Greco-Romans, "Rather than trying to force ancient language into our conceptual schemes, we would do better to try to imagine how ancient Greeks and Romans could see as 'natural' what seems to us bizarre: the nonexistence of the 'individual,' the fluidity of the elements that make up the 'self,' and the essential continuity of the human body with its surrounds" (Martin, 20-21). Martin likens Paul's own view to this when he writes, "The individual Christian body, like that of a slave in Roman law, has no ontological status of its own (Martin, 178). Eastman echoes my reading of Martin when she sums up his teaching: "Many scholars would say that the first-century Mediterranean world had no notion of the self. Dale Martin articulates this view memorably" (Eastman, 12).

[201] Engberg-Pedersen, 16-17.

[202] Ibid, 62.

force of his argument ends up submerging the individual within the corporate body.[203]

However, in light of Paul's caution against community division, we must recognize that within this metaphor Paul's anthropology presupposes the existence of individuals. I shall make two points along this line. First, both Paul's thought structure and his very ability to communicate falls apart without the reality of the human individual.[204] He uses both first-person singular and second-person plural verbs throughout 3:1-17. Paul distinguishes between himself, Apollos, and the Corinthian community. By highlighting the different levels of maturity, Paul even makes distinctions between his faith and that of the Corinthians. Furthermore, in 1:26-31 when the apostle speaks of the manner and state in which the Corinthian brethren received God's life-giving call, Paul recognizes differences among individuals. Second, Paul's entire argument depends upon Corinthians falling behind the leadership of individuals. When the Corinthians label themselves with such slogans as "I follow Paul" and "I follow Apollos," they recognize a difference

---

[203] Engberg-Pedersen's depiction is complex. He speaks of the individual Christian self as filled with material pneuma. He also speaks of individual differences between believers, "differences that are tied to the individual bodies of flesh and blood, to their social locations, and the like (171). However, Engberg-Pedersen at times describes the consequences of this filling using language that seems to negate the individual. He describes the individual Christian selves as "all subsumed" into a single entity of Christ's body (139). He thinks that the temple and body language are not metaphors, but as concrete things (169). After acknowledging differences between embodied believers, he writes, "In short, 'Christ' and the 'body of Christ' *is* that 'one and the same' pneuma that is present in the bodies of all baptized believers, thereby turning them all into a single body [author's emphasis]" (171). Lest we think that this is merely a metaphor similar to Greek political rhetoric, Engberg-Pedersen roundly denies that this is the case, and says that "the entity ('Christ') which was compared with a normal, physical body has itself *become* a body, one that is constituted by the pneuma. Since the pneuma is itself a physical entity, the body that is Christ is in fact a real, physical body – it is coextensive with (if not just identical with) the pneumatic body that Paul will go on to talk about in chapter 15 of the letter [author's emphasis]" (174). He later says, "Clearly, the 'new creation' is to be found in a social group that is also a bodily state, in fact, in the concretely located Christian habitus – with all its various aspects, including bodily purity – that Paul is aiming to develop. That habitus constitutes the temple of God. And it is ontologically made up of pneuma" (204).

[204] Similarly, Eastman writes, "The self may be porous, inextricably enmeshed in a greater continuum of being, and intensely vulnerable to and shaped by its environment, but there is something or someone that can act as the subject of active verbs. The question is how that actor is constituted" (Eastman, 12).

between those two individuals and themselves. When Martin describes the Corinthians and Paul as having no conception of the individual, he goes a step beyond the evidence. Even if Paul frames his anthropology in 1st-century terms rather than in a western Cartesian manner (as Martin and Engberg-Pederson demonstrate), he still presupposes the existence of an individual self. The relationally-constituted self is still an individual self, even if relationality presupposes individuality.[205] Having acknowledged recent scholarly hypotheses that Paul's relational anthropology denies the existence of a self, I conclude that both Paul's argument and his language assumes the individual self (framed in 1st-century terms) even if the self is constituted in relationships.

In this section of chapter two, I employed Rabens' relational model to the image of Christ as the temple's sole foundation in order to draw two conclusions regarding Paul's relational anthropology. First, I argued that the depiction of Christ-as-foundation means that Christ is the source of new-creation life and unity within the Corinthian community. Second, I contended that individuals access this life and unity through Spirit-generated relationships with Christ for the benefit of others. In a subpoint, I argued that Paul's anthropology presupposes individuals even as he depicts the Christian self as relationally-constituted. In conclusion, I argued that Paul's relational anthropology as depicted in the temple metaphor is Christocentric in orientation.

---

[205] See Eastman, 70-76. This answers the objection that the idea of the relationally-constituted self eliminates individuality. Cf. Harriet A. Harris, "Should We Say That Personhood Is Relational?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 51, no. 2 (1998): 222-223.

The Self and the Incomplete Temple

Having used Rabens' model in the first section to demonstrate that the temple metaphor depicts individuals as transformed through relationships in a Christocentric community of new creation, I will further argue in this second section that the self is not a stable entity; the self exists on an apocalyptic spectrum which is determined by both human and divine relationships. I will analyze Paul's image of an incomplete temple through Rabens' relational model in order to accomplish this in three points . First, I will argue that Paul's depiction of an incomplete temple highlights the Corinthian divisions rooted in the immaturity of individual believers. The community needs to be bound together by God's Spirit, who oversees the construction process. Second, I will note how human agency is relationally-determined. Third, I will contend that the shape of the eschatological self depends upon both human and divine relationships. By using Rabens' pneumatic-relational mode to analyze the incomplete temple of 3:9-17, I will argue that the Christian self is relationally-composed through these three points.

Now that I have shown how the temple is a community of new creation and life through the Spirit-created relationship with Christ's person, we must now pay closer attention to the elements of incompleteness within Paul's temple metaphor as it reveals the self as incomplete. Through his construction imagery, Paul depicts the temple as a work in progress. In v. 10 he states that others are actively laboring upon the incomplete temple. While the foundation of Christ has already been laid by Paul, until Christ's return others contribute to the temple project with their different building material (v. 13). However, even then the work will not technically be done. God's temple has much that does not properly belong to the cultic structure. The fire of v. 13 which will accompany

the Parousia will test (δοκιμάσει) the quality of the building. Flammable work will be consumed, leaving behind only that which properly belongs to the temple. Only at the Parousia can we truly describe God's temple project as having reached its completion. Until then, the temple is a work in progress, involving people who truly belong to it and those who do not truly belong. Does this notion of incompleteness subtract from the temple as a true community of new life in Christ?

Critical to this thesis and its use of Rabens' relational model, Paul does not hesitate to label this structure as God's temple even amid its incompletion. This is an unexpected departure from how temples functioned in the ancient world and reveals an important point of tension within the passage. Even while the temple is incomplete and under construction (vv. 10-15), God's Spirit dwells within the sanctuary (vv. 16-17). This is quite unlike the pattern of divine indwelling seen in the consecration of the tabernacle (Exodus 40) and the Solomonic temple (2 Chron. 5). In those two instances, God's presence was seen descending upon the holy structures only after they were fully complete. Paul's words also mark a departure from expected Greco-Roman temple dynamics. While a divine epiphany might indicate that a spot is sacred and requires a temple, neither the Greeks nor the Romans thought that a temple functioned as such until after it had been constructed and consecrated.[206] Paul on the other hand describes the Corinthian temple as presently holy and filled with the divine presence at the same time that the workers are engaged in the messy, chaotic process of construction. Even as the

---

[206] Stevenson, 52. For an example of how one might behave in a sacred grove as opposed to a temple, see Noel Robertson, "Concepts of Purity in Greek Sacred Laws," *in Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, eds. Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), 199-208. For the dynamics of temple consecration, see Linke, "Sacral Purity," 289-309; Orlin, 170-190.

community moves towards its goal of being a full-fledged temple completed by Christ's testing fire, Paul still decides that the label of God's temple is fitting in the present age which will impact how we understand Paul's depiction of the self.

Because Paul is engaging in temple discourse and symbolism within the wider Jewish community, we must situate his thought within the broader Jewish understanding of the unifying power of both the Jerusalem temple and its rituals before we can appreciate how it reflects his anthropology. Only then can we in good faith apply Rabens' relational model to this particular point in Paul's symbol.[207] Jewish writers regularly interpreted the Jerusalem temple as a symbol for oneness. Josephus and Philo are exemplary in this regard. In his reinterpretation of Ex. 20, Josephus understands the Jerusalem temple to reflect the oneness of God and the oneness of the Hebrew people.[208] Later, Josephus echoes Theophrastus (quoted above)[209] and describes the one temple in Jerusalem as a common possession for every Hebrew; just as the one God in heaven is the God of every Hebrew, so too the one Temple in Jerusalem is the temple of every Hebrew.[210] Philo likewise understands the Jerusalem temple as a symbol for oneness. He

---

[207] See Barton, "Jerusalem Temple," 358-360.

[208] Josephus writes, "In no other city let there be either altar or temple; for God is one and the Hebrew race (γένος) is one" (Josephus, *Ant.* 4.8.5).

[209] Josephus writes, "We have but one temple for the one God (for like ever loveth like), common to all as God is common to all (κοινὸς ἁπάντων κοινοῦ θεοῦ ἁπάντων)." This parallel to Theophrastus is significant. At the very least, it shows that the symbolic value of the temple for communal identity was widespread enough in the Greco-Roman world that Josephus appropriated it for his polemical defense of Judaism. He is known for this [See John M. G. Barclay, "Who's the Toughest of Them All? Jews, Spartans and Roman Torturers in Josephus' *Against Apion*," in *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews*, by John M. G. Barclay (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016), 317-329]. Perhaps even more suggestive is that Josephus himself understood the temple in this symbolic light. See Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean*, 346-368.

[210] Josephus *Against Apion* 2.193. Perhaps this emphasis on the universality of God (as opposed to the God of the Hebrew γένος) has to do with Josephus' rhetorical purposes. Later in 2.196-7 he also states that within the temple prayers for the community supersede prayers for the individual.

states categorically that there is only one temple because God is one, and as such all who wish to sacrifice are not permitted to do so at home but rather at the Jerusalem temple.[211] According to Philo, Jews answered God's call from all over the Mediterranean to participate in the cult in Jerusalem. He writes that this formed strong bonds among Jewish people and unified them:

> And we have the surest proof of this in what actually happens. Countless multitudes from countless cities come, some over land, others over sea, from east and west and north and south at every feast. They take the temple for their port as a general haven…Friendships are formed between those who hitherto knew not each other, and the sacrifices and libations are the occasion of reciprocity of feeling and constitute the surest pledge that all are of the same mind (ὁμονοίας).[212]

This quote is particularly notable in our analysis of Paul's concept of the self in his temple metaphor. For Philo, the temple symbolizes God's oneness and the oneness of the people. When Diaspora Jews visit the temple, they form relationships. Those friendships are reinforced through the temple rituals and enact the ideal that the Jewish people hold to the same beliefs. In other words, the temple rituals materially reflect a higher reality.[213] Philo's philosophic understanding of the temple's unifying role among Jews seems to be grounded in some sort of corresponding reality, as the Roman elites jealously took note of the material effects of such temple unity in the Jewish Diaspora.[214]

---

[211] Philo, *The Special Laws* 1.67-68. He writes, "[God] bids them rise up from the ends of the earth and come to this temple."

[212] Philo, *The Special Laws* 1.69-70.

[213] See Nijay Gupta, "The Question of Coherence in Philo's Cultic Imagery: A Socio-literary Approach," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 20, no. 4 (2011): 277-297.

[214] Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean*, 76; 419. Tacitus understands the temple gifts, which he labels as "tribute and contributions," as a distinguishing mark of Jewish people and a source of wealth for Jerusalem (Tacitus, *Hist*. 5.5.1).

Because the Jerusalem temple and its rituals had the power to both symbolize oneness in Jewish writings and effect oneness among the Jewish community, the fact that Paul employs the symbol of an incomplete temple to describe the Corinthian community speaks to the ethical life of the community and, once we apply Rabens' relational framework for ethical empowerment, also reveals the human self as relationally-constituted.

When we apply Rabens' model to Paul's inversion of temple symbolism to see the relational self, we find that the tension between a not-yet-complete temple and an already-functioning temple is made possible only through the presence of God's Spirit in the midst of the community. Paul attributes Corinthian unity to the relational work of God's Spirit in the midst of the temple-community. I noted in chapter one of this thesis that 3:16-17 is a rhetorical invocation of a later topic. We again encounter these topics in 1 Cor. 12 and 14. According to Paul in 1 Cor. 14:12, the Holy Spirit distributes spiritual gifts for the purpose of building up the community (πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας). Moreover, Paul states in 12:11 that it is the Spirit's prerogative to distribute those gifts for the ethical empowerment of individuals according to the Spirit's will (καθὼς βούλεται). Moreover, one's very confession of faith comes from the empowerment of the Spirit (12:3). These ideas seem to be contained *in nuce* in 3:16-17 because it is a rhetorical invocation of later topics in the epistle. Although the building project is incomplete, the Corinthian temple is nevertheless a functioning temple precisely because the Holy Spirit is relationally present to enable the temple's construction and connect the living stones together. Whereas Philo believed in the unity embodied in temple rituals,

Paul places his confidence in the relational-building power of the Holy Spirit in the lives individuals to the degree that he calls the community a "temple."

Just as Paul prioritizes the Spirit's relational presence in designating the community as a temple, we see in Paul's description of human agency that the human self is wholly dependent upon God. Paul's description of human agency in the construction process assigns priority to God's prior work. In the construction of the Corinthian temple in vv. 9-17, Paul portrays divine grace in a way that simultaneously vivifies and drastically qualifies human agency. He attributes all individual and communal Christian growth to God, even to the point of labeling human workers "as not a thing" (vv. 6-7).[215] God's agency clearly takes priority here while human agency is drastically reduced. By employing the temple metaphor, Paul further reinforces the interaction between divine grace and human agency already evident in vv. 6-11. It is as if God himself were overseeing the temple construction work. In vv. 6-7, Paul emphasizes that it is God rather than the worker who is responsible for Christian growth. In v. 10, Paul ascribes his ability as a temple-builder to the grace given to him by God. The apostle's very ability to lay the foundation of Christ is dependent upon God's initial grace; his agency is God-dependent.[216] Paul further qualifies his own agency and that of the builders when he

---

[215] While Paul is rhetorically attacking Corinthian social strata here, his rhetoric depends upon his understanding of divine grace and God's work of new creation. See above my discussion of new creation.

[216] Cf. 1 Cor. 15:10. I first noticed the interplay between divine grace and human agency in this passage after reading John M. G. Barclay, "'By the Grace of God I Am What I Am': Grace and Agency in Philo and Paul," in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, eds. John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 140-157. Examining the movement of agency within 1 Cor. 15:10, Barclay notes that God acts first, then humans respond. However, Paul "swings back [in the final clause] to emphasize the agency of grace again, and explicitly draws attention to this fluctuation by, in some sense, denying the agency of the 'I' in the labour, or at least strongly qualifying it by the reference to the grace of God which is 'with me' [author's emphasis]" (151).

employs the divine passive in v. 11: "For no one is able to lay another foundation besides that which is laid (τὸν κείμενον)." In other words, God is the one who lays the Christ-foundation and all subsequent work is contingent upon his grace. Not only is the temple's construction dependent upon God's agency, but v. 17 emphasizes that God guarantees the quality by destroying (φθείρει) the destroyers of his temple. In summary, God is behind every aspect of the temple-construction: he lays the foundation, he equips the builders, he oversees the construction in person, and he defends the quality of the workmanship. Throughout this passage, we encounter a significant interweaving of divine grace, human agency, and ethics. Because divine grace makes possible the actions of the human worker, the very ability of a human self to act is dependent upon a Spirit-created relationship with God.

Not only is human action dependent upon a proper relationship with God within the temple community, but Paul's relational anthropology depicts human action as constrained by this grace to labor in accordance with God's intention for his gift. Barclay's study in Paul's language of grace is helpful here.[217] In v. 10 Paul describes God's grace as that which enables him to exercise his apostolic calling as a wise master builder.[218] As we know from 1 Cor. 15:8-10, Paul believed himself unworthy of his apostolic call due to his earlier persecution of the church. In Barclay's terminology, Paul is perfecting the incongruity of grace by emphasizing his own unloveliness in 1 Cor 15:8-

---

[217] Barclay acknowledges that the Corinthian correspondence needs to be added to his discussion and looks forward to this occurring (Barclay, *The Gift*, 574). Barclay describes grace as a "polyvalent symbol," capable of being six potential kinds of possible perfections: superabundance, singularity, priority, incongruity, efficacy, and non-circularity (70-75). His study finds that perfects the incongruity of grace in the Christ-event as it relates to the Gentiles. The Christ-event as gift makes irrelevant all preexistent conditions for divine action, be it "ethnicity, status, knowledge, virtue, or gender" (565-567).

[218] Note the instrumental διά (Wallace, 377).

10. However, Christ's appearance upon the road to Damascus had a transformative effect upon Paul's life.[219] Echoing the new creation language we noted above, Paul describes himself as a miscarriage (ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι) brought to life through the Christ event.[220] Ultimately, Paul is able to say in 15:10 that God's grace toward him in Christ was not in vain (οὐ κενὴ) because the miscarriage-turned-apostle ended up working with greater ardor than all the others.[221] In other words, God's gift to Paul in the Christ-event created a fit so that God receives a return (albeit vastly incongruous).[222] Thus, in this particular instance, Paul is not perfecting the notion of a gift's non-circularity.[223] It is to this which Paul refers in 3:10 when he writes that he labored as a wise master builder "according to the grace of God given to me." He calls himself a wise master builder only insofar as he faithfully labors as an apostle who was born through and equipped by God's grace. To those who follow him in the construction task, Paul denies the very possibility of laying a foundation apart from or alongside of Christ (v. 11). The unstated assumption in these two verses is that God's grace constrains ministerial action to a specific purpose: building up the community in the wisdom of the cross rather than according to human

---

[219] Cf. 1 Cor. 9:1 [Stanley E. Porter, *When Paul Met Jesus: How an Idea Got Lost in History* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 94-102]; 1 Cor. 15:1-11 [A. B. du Toit, "Encountering Grace: Towards Understanding the Essence of Paul's Damascus Experience," *Neotestamentica* 30, no. 1 (1996): 71-87].

[220] Simon Butticaz, "The Construction of Paul's Self in His Writings: Narrative Identity, Social Memory and Metaphorical Truth," *Biblical Interpretation* 26, no. 2 (2018): 249-253; Andrzej Gieniusz, "'As a Miscarriage': the Meaning and Function of the Metaphor in 1 Cor. 15:1-11 in Light of Num. 2:12 (LXX)," *The Biblical Annals* 3, no. 1 (March, 2013): 93-107. Regarding the use of the term "conversion" in the new creation language of Paul, see Chester, 164-172.

[221] Chester, 169. Note the theme of resurrection.

[222] Cf. Rom 2:6-15 (Barclay, *The Gift*, 473).

[223] Barclay, *The Gift*, 74. Cf. Gal. 2:21, where Paul uses the adverb δωρεάν to describe grace.

wisdom. God's grace leads to growth, not to the division and competition evident in the community. For builders who fail to labor with the proper materials (i.e., in accordance with the grace given to them), they face eschatological consequences at the Parousia. In vv. 14-15, Paul writes, "If anyone's work which they built up remains, he will receive a reward (μισθὸν). If anyone's work is consumed, he will suffer loss (ζημιωθήσεται)." This verse has provoked significant discussion in the literature on the nature of grace/works[224] and one's eschatological fate.[225] The words μισθὸν and ζημιωθήσεται can likewise operate within the gift framework while also functioning within the realm of commercial exchange.[226] However, Barclay's study of grace resolves some of the tension here. By the use of the phrase κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ in v. 10, Paul has already established that both he and the Corinthian workers are operating in the realm of gift, and they are in a "personal, enduring, and reciprocal relationship" with God.[227] This context for the metaphor grounds these particular glosses of μισθὸν and ζημιωθήσεται within the realm of gift while not necessarily excluding the notion of contractual labor. Indeed, Paul explicitly invokes this contractual sense in v. 8. The most probable solution is that Paul uses the image of a contracted worker laboring under the prospect of the Parousia

---

[224] Fee is typical in this regard. At times, he comes close to expressing discomfort at the juxtaposition of wages the idea of grace as unmerited favor for the undeserving (Fee, 154-157). Conzelmann senses the possibility of contradiction in these verses. Perhaps that is why he writes, "Obviously the picture must not be realistically pressed. It is only a brief hint" (Conzelmann, 76-77). See also Fitzmyer, 200-202.

[225] For those who see Paul as referring to punishment, see BDAG, 428; Conzelmann, 76-77. While it can mean punishment, ζημιόω typically refers to financial loss in broader Greek literature (LSJ, 755). Robertson and Plummer correlate ζημιωθήσεται with τὸν μισθόν and translate the phrase as "he shall be mulcted of the expected rewards" (65). The majority of scholarship takes this approach. See Ciampa and Rosner, 156-167; Fee, 155; Fitzmyer, 200-202; Garland, 118-119; Kuck, 182-183; Albrecht Stumpff, "ζημία, ζημιόω," in *TDNT* 2:888-892. For the term in the Arcadian inscriptions, see Shanor, 461-471.

[226] Ibid, 32. Cf. BDAG, 428, 653; LSJ, 755-756, 1137.

[227] Barclay, *The Gift*, 31.

alongside μισθὸν and ζημιωθήσεται in order to rhetorically disrupt the patron-client approach to ministry in the church. This reframes the temple construction project as a work for God rather than of man.[228] In particular, μισθὸν and ζημιωθήσεται bring out the reciprocity of the Corinthian relationship with God because God's grace creates a fit. God creates fit workers for the temple project who will not build with divisive human wisdom but will labor with the wisdom of the cross. God's Spirit enables all of this by his relational presence in the community. Thus, human agency for Paul is relationally-contingent. In the temple metaphor human agency is both enabled by and constrained by God's grace for the fitting task of community edification.

Because Paul conceives of human agency as relationally-dependent, it deeply matters in his anthropology upon what/whom one's agency rests: if a person is in relationship with Christ through God's Spirit, then that person is empowered to live according to the wisdom of the cross and give life to others. The opposite is also true in an inversion of Rabens' relational model for ethical transformation. Whoever is not in a Spirit-constituted relationship with Christ lacks this life-giving power. Instead, such a person is of the flesh[229] and walking in the ways of man (3:3). Whoever has the spirit of

---

[228] Chow, 100-104; 172-173. Chow thinks that Paul's criticism of patronage networks begins in 1 Cor. 4. However, as noted above, chapter four serves to explain his metaphor in chapter three. We should take Chow's analysis and apply them to 1 Cor. 3.

[229] Paul's use of σάρξ is notoriously complex and multivalent. In some cases, Paul uses it to refer to man's bodily composition. In other cases, Paul ascribes malevolent power to the σάρξ. I understand this particular gloss as a reference to the sinful reality of man's embodied nature and the behavior which flows out of it. See Jewett, 49-166. Because Jewett understands Paul's opponents as Corinthian gnostics, he sees σαρκινοί as referencing the Corinthians' material composition and σαρκικός as an ethical term describing the dualism between the sphere of the flesh the sphere of the spirit (122-123). While modern scholarship rejects the gnostic thesis, it has greatly developed Paul's apocalyptic wordview. See John M. G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark, 1998), 206; Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2011), 335-339; Eastman, 86-91; Stephen Westerholm, "Paul's Anthropological 'Pessimism' in its Jewish Context," in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, eds. John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole

the world (2:12) fails to understand the wisdom of the cross and can therefore only breed

enmity according to this spirit. In Paul's apocalyptic thought, human agency depends

upon one's relationship with either the spirit of the world or the Spirit of God. The twin

characterizations of apocalyptically-shaped human agency and Christians as new

creations growing in maturity together create the image of the human self as on a

spectrum. On one end of the spectrum, we find humans as actively perishing (1:18) on

account of being shaped by the spirit of the age and being enslaved to jealousy and

competition. On the other end of the spectrum, we find humans as fully mature new

creations in the Spirit who build up one another by the Spirit of God. Thus, Paul

understands the self as constructed through apocalyptic relationships.

We see this self-in-relational-flux in 3:1-7 when Paul describes the Corinthians as

incomplete new creations somewhere between the two ends of the spectrum. Despite

calling the Corinthians "brethren (ἀδελφοί)," he laments the fact that he cannot speak to

them as if they were mature, Spirit-led people (ὡς πνευματικοῖς). He labels them instead

as simultaneously fleshly (ὡς σαρκίνοις) and as infants in Christ (ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ).

They need milk rather than solid food. Notice that Paul does not doubt that the

Corinthians are truly new creations in Christ; while the Corinthians are indeed infants in

Christ, they are still *in* this life-giving relationship.[230] However, the jealousy and conflict

apparent within the community show that they are still significantly shaped by their

relationships with the world and as such can still be described as both human and fleshly

---

(London: T&T Clark, 2006), 71-98. For important qualifications on Pauline apocalypticism, see Davies, 149-197.

[230] Chester likewise notes that Paul never calls into question the reality of the Corinthians' conversion. He instead challenges their understanding of conversion and the ramifications for this change of status within the Corinthian community (Chester, 214).

(v. 3). As infants in Christ, the Corinthians are closer to the moment of their new birth and the actively perishing end of the spectrum than they are to the fully mature, new creation end. This is reflected in Paul's description of food. His original work in Corinth involved evangelism and building the church. During this initial period of growth, he fed the Corinthians milk instead of solid food because they were not yet ready for more advanced teaching. However, even now the Corinthians are still not ready for solid food (ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν δύνασθε) because have not progressed from this original point of new birth. Paul's words to the Corinthians shows that he thinks of the human self as existing on a spectrum, in which new creations in Christ are growing toward a goal of maturity that will be manifest in unity and the mutual building up of one another.

In light of Paul's concept of the self as existing upon a spectrum defined by apocalyptic relationships, the application of Rabens' model to Paul's description of the incomplete Corinthian temple will reveal that the Christian self (i.e., one of the living stones of the temple) is in continuous state of relational-construction until the Parousia. We see this in the construction materials of 3:13. In chapter one, I argued that the inflammable material referred to the teaching that successfully built up the Corinthian congregation while the flammable work material referred to teaching that failed to edify believers. Now I will go one step further. Because Paul has used "build up" to specifically capture the concept of Spirit-enable Christian growth in the wisdom of the cross, then it follows that the inflammable construction material which survives the Parousia refers to teaching that reflects Christ's mind. Such teaching builds upon God's act of new creation by leading the Christian to grow from being an infant in Christ to a mature adult in Christ. As such, inflammable building material helps the Christian to put

79

on Christ and put off the flesh, leading to a believer who can be properly described as Spirit-led (πνευματικός) rather than flesh-led (σαρκικός).[231] The opposite is also true. The flammable building material of 3:13 which burns at the Parousia reflects the wisdom of the world. As such, this material does not build upon God's act of new creation and instead contributes to flesh-derived ethics. Thus, depending on the building material used, the human recipient of this teaching may either move towards the goal of Christ's likeness through Spirit-provided material or continue in the state of fleshliness through building materials that come from the spirit of the world. This process of either growth or stagnation continues until death[232] or the Parousia (v. 13), when Christ judges and tests each person (signified by ἔργον).[233] Only after passing through the cleansing fires of judgment (οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός) will the Christian reach full maturity in Christ.[234] In a sense, the Christian self is incomplete prior to the Parousia. Thus, applying Rabens' relational model for ethical empowerment to Paul's temple-construction imagery shows the Christian self as in a continuous state of change along the apocalyptic spectrum.

While Paul does depict the Christian self as in a state of change, his temple metaphor shows that God is the one who brings this change to its decisive completion by intervening in the life of the individual and in the life of the community. I will first assess

---

[231] Cf. Rom. 13:14

[232] 1 Cor. 15:35-49.

[233] Paul is unclear on this topic in 1 Cor. In 1 Cor. 3, he focuses on the purgation of σαρκικός in the believer at the Parousia. In 1 Cor. 15, he focuses on this purgation at death. I suspect that the root of this opaqueness lies with his conception of the resurrection of believers as the consummation of God's salvation in Christ. While this is closely related to my topic of the relationally-constituted self, it lies outside the scope of this particular thesis.

[234] Recall my interpretation of οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός in chapter one. I will return to this theme in more detail in chapter three. For parallels in Jewish literature, see Williams, 272-291.

God's intervention in the life of the individual Christian. I discussed earlier how the interplay between divine grace and human agency reveals that God's Spirit is behind the entire construction process, overseeing the labor from beginning to end as the community grows in the wisdom of the cross (signified in the inflammable building materials of 3:12). This interplay comes to an end in v. 15 as God's monergistic action comes to the forefront of the passage. Paul describes the salvation of an individual believer in spite of the fact that their work perished in the testing fire of the Parousia. This salvation requires purifying flames; indeed, the flames serve as the means by which the formation of the Christian self finds its completion. Just as these flames consumed the fleshly works that came from the believer, so too will the flames consume what is σαρκικός in the believer. Through these flames God completes the salvation that is always in-process in this life precisely because the Christian self is eschatologically-oriented.[235] Thus, the initiation, maintenance, and completion of the Christian self depends upon God's saving-relationship with the believer.

Having argued that the Christian self is in a continuous state of change until God completes it at the Parousia/death, we can see with greater clarity that the temple dynamics in vv. 16-17 have deep relational implications: by intervening in the life of the individual, God protects the other living stones in the relational network. As I noted above, when Paul depicts the Corinthian temple as under construction yet already filled with the relational presence of God's Spirit, his metaphor departs from generally understood notions regarding temples and the divine presence. The dynamics of temple

---

[235] Cf. 1 Cor. 1:18. For more on the temporal aspect of the Christian self, see Anthony C. Thiselton, "Human Being, Relationality and Time in Hebrews, 1 Corinthians and Western Traditions," *Ex Auditu* 13, (1997): 76-95.

holiness are in effect (vv. 16-17) even while the temple is incomplete. This incompleteness results from the ethical lives of individual believers; because the metaphorical temple is composed of individual believers, therefore incomplete Christian selves result in an incomplete temple. Individual Christians who are characterized by fleshly, earthly existence rather than by Spirit-created relationships introduce jealousy and division into the community.[236] Rather than building up other Christians and thereby contributing to the construction of God's temple, these builders destroy God's temple by laboring according to the spirit of the world. However, Paul states that God will protect his temple and the individuals who compose it (v. 17) by destroying the one who introduces jealousy and pride.[237] Thus, we see in God's destruction of the worldly person in vv. 16-17 that the Christian self is relationally-constituted to such a degree that God brings the Christian self to mature fulfillment within a communal context.

Now that I have shown that within Paul's temple metaphor the Christian self is constituted and completed within the temple community through his or her Spirit-created relationship with God, I will now use Rabens' model on 3:12-15 to focus on how the enduring Christian self depends upon Spirit-created relationships with other believers. In chapter one of this thesis, I argued that Paul's metaphorical use of ἔργον in vv. 13-15 correlates with his identical use of ἔργον in 9:1, and therefore it refers to the believers in the Corinthian congregation. Therefore, when Paul warns that the Day of the Lord will reveal every laborer's work (ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον) through the fire of the Parousia, he is saying that the fire will both test and reveal *people*. Likewise, in vv. 14-15, Paul speaks

---

[236] Liu, 124-127.

[237] Cf. 1 Cor. 5:1-13.

of the *people* surviving the fire or *people* being consumed by the fire. These statements come in the context of a warning to the Corinthian teachers about the building material they use, with flammable material pertaining to the wisdom of the world and inflammable material pertaining to the wisdom of the cross. Thus the eschatological durability of people depends upon the quality of the teaching used, and whether or not it contributes to growth in Christlikeness. That Paul understands the self as relationally-constituted is significant for my thesis. Paul is in essence saying that at some level the eschatological self depends upon human relationships. Through human relationships, a laborer might contribute to the ultimate destruction of a person by teaching in accordance with the spirit of the world. On the other hand, laborers can add to the growth of the Christian self and a person's ultimate endurance if they work according to the grace of God and through God's Spirit. This has frightening consequences for a teacher, and this is why Paul warns in 3:21, "Let no one boast in men."[238] At the same time, the eschatological state of the Christian worker is relationally determined as well. If the people to whom the Christian worker ministers survive the testing of the Parousia, then that worker will gain a heavenly reward (v. 14). Conversely, if the living stone is consumed at the Parousia, then the Christian worker who survives the testing will lose out on the heavenly reward. Paul does not expound upon the nature of this heavenly reward, but it probably relates to 1 Cor.

---

[238] This particular point (among others) divides Paul from Stoic thinkers like Epictetus. As Dunson writes, "For Epictetus, the individual self has an absolute primacy that cannot be compromised without at the same time jeopardizing a fundamental tenet of his philosophy, namely, that nothing external – including social relations – may be allowed to determine one's happiness…For Paul, the individual is *necessarily* embodied within the body of all believers, which is the body of Christ. Paul does not share Epictetus's worry about external things affecting us. In fact, Paul believes that many external things *should* affect us" [Ben C. Dunson, "All for One and One for All: Individual and Community in Paul and Epictetus," in *Paul and the Giants of Philosophy: Reading the Apostle in Greco-Roman Context*, eds. Joseph R. Dodson and David E. Briones (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2019), 70-71.

9:24-27.[239] Thus, at the level of rewards, the Christian worker's eschatological identity is constituted by relationships (even if the precise nature of this eschatological constitution remains a mystery to us). However, Paul is careful to state that the soteriological fate of the Christian worker does not depend upon the fate of other living stones. Even if these works are consumed, the Christian worker will survive (v. 15). It is only when Paul rhetorically heightens his argument in v. 16 through the οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι clause that he suggests a worker might not survive God's judgment. This rhetorical elevation likewise raises the moral stakes. I will engage with this in greater detail in chapter three of this thesis. I will only say here that when Paul writes in v. 17 of the destruction of the worker who destroys God's temple he appears to be speaking of the person who intentionally destroys God's temple through immorality or false teaching rather than merely of a minister whose congregants fail to endure. In summary, I have analyzed 3:12-15 using Rabens' pneumatic-relational model and have concluded that the eschatological Christian self is formed in human and divine relationships

In this section on the incomplete temple in 1 Cor. 3:9-17 , I made three points regarding the relational self by using Rabens' model. First, I argued that God's Spirit constructs both the temple-community and the individual by enabling growth in maturity. Second, I suggested that human agency is relationally-determined. Third, I contended that human and divine relationships in some way determine the identity of the eschatological self. Rabens' pneumatic-relational model enabled me to argue that we can see a relational anthropology in Paul's metaphorical incomplete temple.

---

[239] Ciampa and Rosner, 157. Whatever the answer might be, this may be an instance of a mystery to be contemplated rather than a problem to be solved.

Conclusion

In this chapter of my thesis, I built upon the exegesis of chapter one and applied Rabens' pneumatic-relational model to Paul's extended temple metaphor (3:9-17). This allowed me to show that even while Paul writes of individual Christians, he does so in a way that undermines individual autonomy. His language and his temple metaphor show that he understands the self as fundamentally shaped by relationships. I showed this in two sections.

In the first section of this chapter, I analyzed the Christocentricity of Paul's relational anthropology by employing Rabens' model on the image of Christ as the temple foundation. I contended that the idea of a temple foundation demonstrates that Christ's person (as the embodiment of God's power and wisdom) is the source of new life for the community. As a consequence of this new life, God's Spirit unites individuals with Christ and other believers and brings to fulfillment the oneness motif of the temple. I further argued that this radical reorientation of the self reveals the extent of the shaping power of relationships. While Paul does speak of the individual (contrary to the positions of those noted above), he presents the individual as open to and deeply affected by Spirit-generated relationships with Christ and others. Thus, Paul understand the Christian relational self as centered in Christ.

In the second section of this chapter, I viewed the incomplete aspects of Paul's temple through Rabens' model in order to argue that the Christian self exists on a relationally-determined spectrum. I did this in three ways. First, I examined notions of oneness which contemporaries projected upon the Jerusalem temple and showed how Paul's image of an incomplete temple revealed a divided community. Paul squares the

idea of an incomplete with the divine presence already inhabiting the structure. I did this by showing how God himself builds the temple through human agents building up one another through the wisdom of the cross. Thus, as individuals are built up in Christ so too is God's temple constructed. Second, I argued that this depiction of Christians suggests that the Christian self exists on a spectrum in this life, in which the self is either moving toward the goal of maturity in Christ or backwards towards the powers of sin. I suggested that this spectrum has significant implications for the eschatological scenario within Paul's metaphor. Third I argued that because the self exists on a spectrum influenced by relationships one's eschatological identity is likewise relationally-determined. In the case of soteriology, the eschatological self is determined by God alone. However, one's eschatological rewards are indeed determined by the fate of other individuals. By examining the incompleteness of the temple in Paul's metaphor, I concluded that Paul presents the Christian self as deeply shaped by relationships along an apocalyptic spectrum so that we can say that for Paul the self is relationally-constituted.

Chapter 3: Applying Douglas' Methodology to the Temple Metaphor

Chapter Summary

Does temple purity factor into our interpretation of Paul's temple metaphor, and how do our findings help us interpret Paul's anthropology? These are my guiding questions in this chapter. In this chapter, I will continue my project of bringing out Paul's relational anthropology as it is found in the temple metaphor of 1 Cor. 3:9-17. Having first noted the relationality of the passage using Rabens' model, I will now turn to Douglas' structuralist methodology. The first section will highlight how the persons who make up the metaphorical temple are embedded in an eschatological social order of vertical and horizontal relationships. The second section will argue that the concept of an embodied Christocentric *habitus* is the best concept for describing Paul's depiction of the embodied self. Through these two points, I will conclude that Paul views the relationally constituted self as both embodied and embedded within a Christocentric eschatological social order.

The State of Scholarship: Entering the Discussion

While use of Douglas' approach has a long history in Jewish scholarship,[240] few scholars to my knowledge have attempted to apply Douglas' framework to Paul's

---

[240] For a small range of examples in Jewish studies, see Susan Haber, *"They Shall Purify Themselves": Essays on Purity in Early Judaism*, ed. Adele Reinhartz (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), *passim*; Christine B. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2002), *passim*; Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, *passim*. However, Jacob Neusner (himself an expert in the purity codes of Israel) criticizes Douglas' harmonizing approach to the Torah. Cf. Jacob Neusner, "The Contribution of Anthropology: A Response to Mary Douglas and Edmund Perry," *Theology Today* 41, no. 4 (1985): 428-430. Even so, both Neusner and

metaphor in 1 Cor. 3:9-17, with notable exceptions in the cases of Barton, Liu, and Suh.[241] Even those works which do engage with the concepts of pollution and impurity throughout 1 Corinthians do so without using Douglas' structuralism as the primary means for interpreting the meaning of these categories and connecting them with Paul's broader theology.[242] For example, when Martin applies her framework to the other occurrences of Paul's temple metaphor (such as 1 Cor. 6:12-20), he equates the notion of pollution to "disease" only and does not discuss pollution as "ritual impurity," leaving Douglas out of the conversation.[243] Many scholars only engage with her thinking at a surface level when it comes to the Pauline temple rather than using her theory as a central

---

Jacob Milgrom interact with her material. See Jacob Neusner, *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 1973), 120-128; Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Yale Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 1:718-737.

[241] Stephen C. Barton, "Dislocation and Relocating Holiness: A New Testament Study," in *Holiness: Past and Present*, ed. Stephen C. Barton (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 195-201; "The Jerusalem Temple," 374; Liu, 114-127. Suh notes this surprising lack of scholars who apply Douglas' methodological lens to Paul's idea of temple. See Michael K. W. Suh, *Power and Peril: Paul's Use of Temple Discourse in 1 Corinthians* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020), 16. Harrington does an admirable job in broadly applying Douglas' methodology to Paul's temple metaphors in 1 Corinthians, but her framing of the issues is problematic. For Harrington, the Pauline metaphor of community-as-temple depends upon a prior understanding of an individual's body as a temple. The individual takes logical priority over the community. According to her thinking, because the community is a group of bodies-as-temple Paul can then properly describe the community as a temple. Thus, in Harrington's section entitled "The Metaphor of Community as Temple," her section on Paul focuses on the notion that the body is a temple (Harrington, 58-61). Then, Harrington's exegesis of 1 Cor. 3:16-17 falls under the section "The Body as Temple in 1-2 Corinthians" (323-332). Thus, even though Harrington uses Douglas' methodology, her framing of Paul's metaphor blurs rather than clarifies the boundary between the individual and the community. Paul's temple metaphors give no clear logical priority of the individual body-as-temple over the community-as-temple.

[242] Suh, 16. Harrington concurs in this judgment when she writes, "A full treatment of Paul's understanding of purity and holiness in light of its Jewish roots is lacking in scholarship today. Not since Michael Newton's [work] has there been an attempt to examine purity in Pauline literature in monograph form, and to my knowledge, there is no similar attempt in the matter of holiness" (38).

[243] Cf. Martin, 163-197. However, "disease" and "ritual" were not easily separated in the ancient world; see Bendlin's comment on competing and complementary understandings of purity in Hippocrates and Sophocles (Bendlin, 179-184). Likewise, see Suh's penetrating critique of Martin's class-based analysis of pollution (Suh, 7).

methodological approach.[244] Two factors explain why scholars have not used Douglas as the primary methodological guides in their interpretations of 1 Cor. 3. First, past treatments of 1 Cor. 3:9-17 have tended to fit Paul's argument through an evolutionary framework, in which Paul's thought represents the next step in the evolution of religion from material cult superstition to something akin to modern notions of morality.[245] In this stream of thought, Paul's primary purpose in identifying the community as a temple is to show how the Christian church replaces the Jerusalem temple.[246] Douglas' work stands squarely against such an interpretation of religious thought by showing the connection between material cult and morality,[247] and therefore those who continue to "spiritualize" Paul's temple metaphor have not made use of her insights (I say "continue" because the original proponents of the "spiritualization" thesis precede Douglas' work). Since much

---

[244] Cf. Beale, 245-268; Will Deming, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), *passim*; Weissenrieder, 407-411. Citation of Douglas are missing from Bonnington, Engberg-Pedersen, Strack, and Wardle. Of the commentaries which cite Douglas, I have found that only Thiselton seems to draw upon her work in his translation of φθείρει (315-318). Hogeterp utilizes Douglas' grid-group model of language in other passages of 1 Corinthians, but not in 1 Cor. 3. Neither does he include her structuralist methodology regarding purity language (20, 301-302). An exception here would be Newton. He touches upon Douglas' understanding of impurity as that which does not fit a symbolic system, but he does not use this as his main methodology for understanding Paul (79-97). This is likely because he believes that "Paul does not have a systematically-worked-out and harmonized theory according to which the rites of the Bible are transferred to the Christian community, nor does his Temple have a specific location (53)." Because Douglas' model presupposes the systematic ordering of ideas, it is understandable that Newton would refrain from using her methodology. Harrington likewise is an important exception here. However, her methodology rests more upon the works of Milgrom and Neusner than it does on Douglas (1-43), and she does not apply Douglas to 1 Cor. 3.

[245] This approach has been labeled "spiritualization of the temple" and has its roots in Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe*, *passim*. Representatives of this group include Conzelmann, 77; Gärtner, 102-103; McKelvey, 58; Newman, 52-60. Although Harrington places Lanci in this category (Harrington, 328), Lanci is deeply critical of the "spiritualization" approach (Lanci, 9-19). He writes, "The temple is not intended as an ontological description of the community; that is, Paul is not attempting to establish here the fundamental nature of the community as a temple" (Lanci, 125).

[246] McKelvey goes so far as to write, "To think of the new temple is to think also of the new cult" (McKelvey, 107).

[247] Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 8-35.

of the scholarship subsequent to the "spiritualization" thesis has been spent either clarifying or reassessing this heritage, Douglas' insights have been understandably ignored.[248] However, given that Paul's rhetorical intent is to encourage holiness in the community rather than to articulate a Temple-replacement theology,[249] Douglas' methodology will help us further understand both his argument and its anthropological implications. Second, Paul's own hostility to works of the law (Gal. 3) and to his apparent disregard for purity rituals have discouraged scholars from attempting a Douglas-like systematization of Paul's references to purity.[250] However, as Barton, Liu, and Suh recognize in their own works, Paul concerns himself with the *symbolism* of purity and temple rather than with the Jerusalem temple itself and with the material practice of purity rituals. He is interested in how the Christ-event shapes the self in a way that fits with the metaphorical referent.[251] This accords with Douglas' main concern: how the practitioner's world is shaped by the formative power of ritual purity. Because Douglas' methodology has not been appreciably utilized in analyzing Paul's temple metaphor, this chapter marks my attempt at a fresh contribution (albeit limited) in the exegesis of 1 Cor. 3:9-17.

Just as Douglas' structuralist approach is experiencing something of a renaissance in New Testament studies as scholars assess purity language in works of the New

---

[248] See the excellent survey of scholarship in Hogeterp, 1-14.

[249] Bonnington, 155.

[250] Cf. Newton, 53.

[251] Cf. Gal. 3:24-4:5.

Testament,[252] a similar development is occurring in classical scholarship which may help

us as we apply Douglas' model to Paul's temple metaphor. Moreover, the research done

by Liu and Suh on the topic of Pauline temple rhetoric and other examples of temple

rhetoric in the ancient Mediterranean suggests that engagement with models offered by

classicists will reveal the connection between temple symbolism/rhetoric and Pauline

anthropology. Classicists have begun to apply Douglas' work in fresh ways to Greco-

Roman material on ritual and ritual purity, giving us a deeper understanding of ancient

cultic life. Building on Douglas' work, Robert Parker offered the first systematic

treatment of Hellenistic purity codes.[253] Even while scholars have challenged the

harmonizing tendency of Parkers' systematic approach, they agree that his overall thesis

is valid: namely, that Hellenistic purity codes embed the individual within a divine and

social order.[254] Only recently have others furthered Parker's project and continued it in

Roman studies.[255] At the same time, Angelos Chaniotis' work has highlighted the ethical

side of purity by showing the importance of a person's cognition and disposition towards

---

[252] Cf. Rogan, "Purity in Early Judaism," 309-339.

[253] Parker, *Miasma*, *passim*.

[254] Cf. Andreas Bendlin, "Purity and Pollution," in *A Companion to Greek Religion*, ed. Daniel Ogden (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 178-189. Bendlin proposes that the Greeks had competing yet complementary interpretive models of purity and pollution that varied from city to city. Thus, for example, Hippocrates believes that a pollution is carried upon humid air into a city while Sophocles depicts pollution as an individual person who has violated the order of the gods. At first glance these are very different ideas. However, a second look reveals that both Hippocrates and Sophocles understand pollution to be the result of human trespass against the divine even if they differ in their views of the precise nature and mechanism of the pollution. This is an example of congruent yet competing models of purity in the Greek world, and according to Bendlin one could conduct many such comparisons.

[255] Petrovich and Petrovich, 3-6. For a systematic treatment of Roman notions of purity, see Lennon, *passim*.

purity regulations as he or she interact with the gods.[256] Chaniotis' work has

demonstrated that Hellenistic purity codes, while cognitive in nature, embedded the

individual in a divine and social order. This theme has been taken up by Andrej Petrovich

and Ivana Petrovich, who argue that Greek people had categories for outer (ritual) and

inner (cognitive/moral) purity, both of which were equally important for ritual interaction

with the gods and had a subsequent impact in social relationships.[257] While these models

come from specialists in the classics, they can be fruitfully applied to Jewish thinkers.[258]

Suh has likewise demonstrated that we can profitably use these models in examining

Paul's temple discourse in 1 Corinthians.[259] These advances in scholarly understandings

of non-Jewish Greco-Roman purity merit a fresh examination of Paul's temple metaphor

through Douglas' model, and because classicists use Douglas' methodology to ask

similar questions of Greco-Roman sources, I will use their observations as we ask related

anthropological question of Paul's temple metaphor.

---

[256] Angelos Chaniotis, "Greek Ritual Purity: From Automatisms to Moral Distinctions," in *How Purity Is Made*, eds Petra Rösch and Udo Simon (Wiesbaden, DE: Harrassowitz, 2012), 123-139; "Ritual performances of divine justice," 115-153; "Under the watchful eyes of the gods," 1-43

[257] Petrovich and Petrovich, *passim*. While the second-volume of their work (which will cover the evidence in the Roman Imperial period) has yet to be released, their first-volume has been well-received within classical studies. See Saskia Peels-Matthey, review of *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion: Early Greek Religion*, by Andrej Petrovich and Ivana Petrovich, *Kernos* 31, no. 1 (2018): 1-5, https://journals.openedition.org/kernos/2778; Nickolas P. Roubekas, review of *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion: Early Greek Religion*, by Andrej Petrovich and Ivana Petrovich, *Religious Studies Review* 44, no. 3 (Fall 2018): 332; Robin Waterfield, review of *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion: Early Greek Religion*, by Andrej Petrovich and Ivana Petrovich, *Heythrop Journal* 58, no. 6 (November 2017): 961-962.

[258] Cf. Beate Ego, "Purity Concepts in Jewish Traditions of the Hellenistic Period," in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, eds. Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), 477-492.

[259] Suh, 110-153.

The Plan for this Chapter

In this chapter on Paul's temple metaphor, I will deepen my discussion of the relational self in Paul be employing Douglas' structuralist approach in order to argue that Paul understands that the relationally-constituted self is remade in horizontal relationships with others and in a vertical relationship with Christ. Because I am filling a gap in scholarship at this point, I will be making new observations that build off my first two chapters. I posited in chapter one that the temple metaphor of 3:9-17 is modeled on the Jerusalem temple and depicts the metaphorical temple as composed of persons. Using Rabens' model in chapter two, I argued that Paul presents the Christian self as existing on a spectrum between sin and death on one end and full maturity in the new life of Christ on the other end. Relationships are the means by which one moves along this spectrum between chaos and Christ. A relational matrix of persons who are fully mature in Christ results in a mature, complete temple of God. In two sections of this chapter, I will examine how the symbolism of temple holiness captures the embodied nature of Paul's relational anthropology and embeds the self within a network of relationships.

In the first section of this chapter on Paul's relational anthropology, I will apply Douglas' methodology to demonstrate how the temple metaphor of 1 Cor. 3:9-17 embeds the self within an eschatological social order. I will make three points on this theme. First, I will look to the wider symbolism of the ancient Mediterranean world and place Paul within this broader context. Second, I will show how the self is morally formed by relationships and how this is depicted in the temple holiness dynamic. Third, I will posit that Paul understands the Christian community to be a mirror in some respects of the heavenly order. When this order and the self are threatened by moral pollution, God

protects both by destroying the destroyers. From these three points, I will conclude that the relationally-constituted Christian self is central to Paul's temple metaphor in 1 Cor. 3:9-17.

In the second section of this chapter, Douglas' insights will enable me to argue that Paul's temple metaphor creatively depicts the centrality of the body in his relational theology. As I interact with some of the insights made by Barclay, Engberg-Pedersen, and Martin, I will make three main points. First, I will provide a compact exegesis of 6:12-19 which will in turn make two points that reveal a key component of Paul's two temple metaphors: the metaphor of "body as temple" in 6:12-19 cannot be separated from the metaphor of "community as temple" in 3:9-17. Second, I will address the concerns which scholars have about reading 3:9-17 in tandem with 6:12-19. I will then show how my exegesis in the previous chapters (along with my exegesis of 6:12-19) resolves those concerns. This will allow me to propose that the temple metaphor depicts an embodied Christian *habitus* that is relationally constituted. Third, I will interact with the Christological aspects of the temple metaphor and their ramifications for the relationally-embodied *habitus*. Through these Douglas-enabled points, I will argue that Paul depicts the Christian body as relationally constituted alongside other believers in Christ.

The Relationality of Paul's Temple Discourse

In this section on Paul's relational anthropology, I will use Douglas' model of purity on the temple metaphor of 1 Cor. 3:9-17 to highlight how its holiness language is implicitly relational. I will make three points in this section. First, I will briefly show how ancient people understood rituals and temples as symbols for vertical relationships with the divine and horizontal relationships with others. This will place Paul within such

94

discourse. Second, I will show how Paul depicts the Corinthians as morally shaped through relationships. Third, I will show how Paul's metaphor embeds the Christian self within an eschatological order (in some respects). From these three points, I will conclude that Paul's temple symbolism captures the relationality which is at the heart of Paul's anthropology; namely, that the Christian self is formed through the interplay of vertical and horizontal relationships.

As we trace Paul's relational anthropology in his temple metaphor through Douglas' model, we need to place Paul's metaphor within the context of how ancient people understood temple rituals as symbolic of relationships, a move which will clarify how Paul's temple symbols describe relational realities. Paul's symbolic speech takes place within the cultural environment of the ancient Mediterranean basin, a region which was conducive for socially-restricted speech and positional family control systems.[260] While Paul does not seem to explicitly concern himself with ritual proper in 1 Corinthians 3:9-17, his use of temple in his metaphor draws upon a deep well of ritual symbolism and restricted communication. It may be argued that Paul does not explicitly raise the notion of rituals in chapter 3 like he does in chapter 10, and therefore scholarly attempts to see ritual symbolism in the context of 3:9-17 would miss Paul's point of comparison. However, Douglas gives us good reason for thinking otherwise. Paul's point of comparison depends on the "common backcloth" of ancient discourse surrounding temple ritual and symbolism. Douglas has analyzed rituals and symbolism in such societies, and has come to the conclusion that rituals and symbols are a form of restricted

---

[260] See the methodological section of my introduction for a discussion of socially-restricted speech and positional family control (Douglas, *Natural Symbols*, 31). For similar conclusions, see Suh, 201.

communication (or "restricted code" in linguistic terms). If the community knows each other well and shares "a common backcloth of assumptions," this code does not need to be made explicit.[261] We must remember that temples functioned as one such example of a cultural symbol laden with different ritual meanings. Temples were the loci of ritual performances in the ancient world by nature of their space being rendered sacred by the presence of the divine.[262] If the inhabitants of the ancient Mediterranean world largely understood ritual to be a highly-controlled form of communication[263] with the divine,[264] then any reference to a temple would likely bring these ritual encounters with the divine into the minds of those accustomed to thinking in such a way.[265] Therefore, in using Douglas' model, we need to place Paul's metaphor within the broader discourse of temple symbolism in order to grasp the force of Paul's relational rhetoric and its implications for his anthropology.

Not only is Douglas' structuralist theory of communication helpful as we analyze Paul's temple metaphor and his own relational anthropology, Douglas' structuralism theory of purity and symbolism enable us to see that (within Greek-influenced thought) temples and rituals symbolized the self amidst vertical and horizontal relationships. Ritual purity signals this. Temples and purity systems were intertwined in the ancient

---

[261] Douglas, *Natural Symbols*, 58. Barclay argues that this is indeed the case in Corinth based on his study of language use in 1 Corinthians (Barclay, "Social Dialect," 206-215).

[262] At the very least, rituals were often performed within the immediate vicinity of a temple. For how this might very depending on the particular context, ritual, or location, see Linke, "Sacral Purity," 289-309.

[263] Douglas, *Natural Symbols*, 22.

[264] Chaniotis, "Ritual performances of divine justice," 115-153; "Under the watchful eyes of the gods," 1-43.

[265] Cf. John C. Poirier, "Three early Christian views on ritual purity: a historical note contributing to an understanding of Paul's position," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 81, no. 4 (Dec. 2005): 428-430.

world; we cannot understand one without the other.[266] Douglas helps explain the

connection between the two when she writes, "Defilement is never an isolated event. It

cannot occur except in view of a systematic ordering of ideas…the only way in which

pollution ideas make sense is in reference to a total structure of thought whose keystone,

boundaries, margins and internal lines are held in relation by rituals of separation."[267] In

the ancient world, temples sat at the heart of this systematic ordering.[268] These systems of

purity and defilement are expressed through ritual and place the individual within an

established order.[269] As such, purity systems presuppose relationships between objects

and/or individuals, and the state of "pure" and "impure" categorize these relationships.

That which does not fit society's notions of order is labeled as dirt, or that which "offends

against order," according to Douglas.[270] If left uncontrolled, dirt and disorder have the

power to destroy the system and lead to formlessness and disintegration.[271] Ancient

temples sit at the heart of this total theological structure due to the divine presence within,

and their destruction symbolized the destruction of the order and relationships they

---

[266] Or, at the very least, purity system is inseparable from contact with the divine.

[267] Douglas, *Purity*, 51.

[268] For examples, see Parker, *Miasma*, *passim*; Moyna McGlyn, "Authority and Sacred Space: Concepts of the Jerusalem Temple in Aristeas, Wisdom, and Josephus," *Biblische Notizen* 161, (2014): 115-140.

[269] Ibid, 158-159. Douglas writes, "Any culture is a series of related structures which comprise social forms, values, cosmology, the whole of knowledge and through which all experience is mediated. Certain cultural themes are expressed by rites of bodily manipulation. In this very general sense primitive culture can be said to be autoplastic…The rituals enact the form of social relations and in giving these relations visible expression they enable people to know their own society. The rituals work upon the body politic through the symbolic medium of the physical body."

[270] Ibid, 2.

[271] Douglas, *Purity*, 198-199.

represented.[272] We need to bear this in mind as we use Douglas' model on Greek temple discourse and situate Paul's temple metaphor within this discourse in order to better see his relational anthropology.

In light of different groups understanding the symbolism of the Jerusalem temple various and conflicting ways (as Hogeterp and Liu demonstrate),[273] I will in this section discuss how Paul himself gives us an exegetical basis for understanding his metaphor as a relational symbol and thus as an indicator of his anthropology (which allows us analyze the temple symbolism for Paul's anthropology in the next paragraph). We can see him doing precisely this at three different points in the pericope where he emphasizes the vertical relational symbolism of the temple. First, Paul's syntax and rhetoric in 3:9-17 reveal his own focus on the Corinthians' vertical relationship with God. When Paul writes in v. 9, "For you all are God's fellow workers, God's fruited field, God's building project," he places the possessive genitive in the emphatic position (θεοῦ συνεργοί; θεοῦ γεώργιον; θεοῦ οἰκοδομή).[274] This construction calls his readers' attention to their vertical relationship with God. Second, Paul explicitly reminds the Corinthians workers that they are answerable to God on the day of judgment and will receive from God either the giving of rewards or the withholding of wages. He will remind them immediately

---

[272] Consequently, the adherence to purity codes is an intensely ethical matter. See Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan, "Introduction," in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, eds. Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), 20.

[273] Both Hogeterp and Liu recognize the rhetorical symbolism of the temple and present a wealth of Greco-Roman and Jewish material to demonstrate this. However, their works leave unclear precisely where Paul is choosing to engage with this widespread symbolism. As such, they do not further elucidate the rhetorical purposes of Paul's discourse beyond engaging the emotions of his readers.

[274] Fee, 144.

after the temple pericope that they are Christ's own possession (v. 23). Third, the οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι clause of v. 16 is a rhetorical marker which emphasizes the content of the verse: the community is God's temple in which God's Spirit dwells.[275] At these three points we see Paul drawing the Corinthians' attention to their vertical relationship with God. Second, we also see Paul reframing the Corinthians' horizontal relationships with one another. In chapter one of this thesis, I demonstrated how in v. 13-15 ἔργον refers to the people of the Corinthian community. When Paul speaks of the ἔργον being consumed at the Parousia as a result of poor construction material, he means that people will be consumed by the fire of judgment as a consequence of their being shaped by the wordly instruction of the Corinthian teachers. Therefore, Paul's words to the Corinthian builders in v. 17 comes as a warning to those who fail to edify other people. Paul's vivid threat reminds the Corinthians of the importance of their horizontal relationships with one another. In summary, based on Paul's focus upon vertical and horizontal relationships within 3:9-17 and his rhetorical emphasis upon the metaphorical temple, we should partially treat the temple as a symbol for relationships within the community.

Given that Paul himself emphasizes vertical and horizontal relationships prior to the rhetorical climax of vv. 16-17, I will first explore how his description of the community as a temple reveals his relational anthropology by capturing the community's vertical relationship with God in a single image. This relational symbolism appears more probable than a theology of temple spiritualization or memorable rhetorical symbol.[276] Barry Webb's essay on Old Testament depictions of tabernacle and temple is helpful for

---

[275] See chapter one of this thesis.

[276] Lanci labels this use of temple as *imago agens* (Lanci, 121-128).

us here, since he traces the relational symbolism of both structures.[277] First, both the

Mosaic tabernacle and the Solomonic temple served as biblical symbols for Israel's

vertical relationship with God. Both structures housed the symbol of God's covenant

relationship with Israel[278] and depicted God's relational presence in the midst of the

nation. In the Old Testament narrative, the Hebrew scriptures highlight the incongruity

between Israel's idolatrous behavior with other gods and her vertical relationship with her

saving God by noting that the law is housed in the tabernacle and/or temple.[279] In 1 Cor.

3:16-17 Paul applies the label of temple to the Corinthian community in a way which

highlights the incongruity between the Corinthian partisanship (a way of worldly

idolatry) and their vertical relationship with God.[280] Second, the Hebrew scriptures make

it clear that tabernacle's/temple's purpose is to allow God's relational presence in the

midst of Israel and is closely related to God's fulfillment of his covenant promises.[281]

Webb, for example, has demonstrated that the author(s) of 1 Kings links the fulfillment of

God's covenant promise to Abraham with the construction of the Solomonic temple.[282] In

1 Cor. 3:16-17, Paul evokes God's presence to remind the Corinthian community of their

relationship with God. More importantly, God's presence in the community springs from

---

[277] Barry G. Webb, "Heaven on Earth: the Significance of the Tabernacle in its Literary and Theological Context," in *Exploring Exodus: Literary, Theological and Contemporary Approaches*, ed. Brian S. Rosner and Paul R. Williamson (Nottingham, UK: Apollos, 2008), 154-176.

[278] Exodus 40:20; 1 Kings 8:21-26; 2 Kings 23:1-3

[279] Webb, 157.

[280] Cf. 1 Cor. 6:19. Paul will later reintroduce Exodus motifs in 1 Cor. 10 in order to combat idolatry in the community.

[281] Harrington, 330. Cf. Ex. 25:8.

[282] 1 Kings 4-5; Webb, 167.

the fulfillment of his promises to redeem his people. As such, Christ's work on the cross and Christ's being the foundation of the community enables God's Spirit to be present in the community. Paul expects an ethical change in the community as a result of this relationship with God, and thus he employs the temple symbol to highlight the ethical dimensions of God's promises and his presence. This leads me to my third point regarding the vertical relationship symbolized by the temple: Paul's imagery captures both the ethical and ontological distance between God and man. Webb notes how the Old Testament authors use the symbolism of the tabernacle and the temple to show how God is the only one who is intrinsically holy, while the structures and the people who maintain them derive their holiness from God only after ritual cleansing.[283] Because man is unholy in both substance and in deed, the temple rituals structure and thereby enable God's presence amidst his people.[284] Given that the temple carefully controls the interaction between God and man by both emphasizing God's transcendence while simultaneously keeping a distance between the two parties, it comes as a surprise that Paul should label as "temple" the Corinthian *people* rather than a *building*.[285] By equating people with the

---

[283] Webb, 170.

[284] Cf. Parker, *Miasma*, *passim*. Parker observes a similar dynamic in Hellenistic pagan religions. He writes that the Greeks understood purity to be a point within a spectrum of sacred-profane-polluted (31). He directly cites a dossier of purity regulations at Cyrene to demonstrate that this spectrum is not an "analyst's abstraction," but an articulated reality in Greek religious thought. As such, so Parker argues, purity mattered only when one wished to approach the gods; the rest of life was spent in the realm of the profane. Greeks expected humans to become polluted through the natural processes of life (such as through sex, childbirth, menstruation, and death) and they largely did not attempt to shield others from these pollutions. Rather, they principally concerned themselves with shielding the gods from these mortal processes (65). Therefore, the Greeks carefully followed purity requirements before approaching the divine (177). For the epigraphic information at Cyrene, see CGRN 99, lines A20-25.

[285] I discussed the novelty of this identification in chapter one. While the Corinthians may not have been surprised at this comparison (a possibility with Paul's use of the positive interrogative particle οὐκ), identifying a group of people as a temple was not common in the ancient Mediterranean (Suh, 27).

temple and describing God's Spirit as in the midst of the Corinthians, Paul effectively

abolishes the very distance that the temple maintains. He reveals God's immediate

relational presence in the community (without the protection afforded by temple rituals).

This strongly emphasizes the Corinthians' vertical relationship with God and their need

for ethical behavior. Because temples were first consecrated and made holy prior to them

becoming abodes of the divine, Paul's identification of the community as temple suggests

that something has fundamentally changed about themselves (a fact I will return to in

section two of this chapter, since it is significant to understanding Paul's relational

anthropology). In the three points outlined above, we see Paul using the Jerusalem temple

as a symbol for the community's vertical relationship with God and to remind them of

their identity in light of this relationship.

Through an application of Douglas' structuralist methodology to the holiness

dynamic of v. 17 in Paul's temple metaphor, we can clarify the much-debated translation

of φθείρει, which will further highlight Paul's relational anthropology: we can say that

the self is relationally shaped because the horizontal relationships within the community

are bound closely with their vertical relationship with God. Paul writes in 3:17, "If

anyone corrupts (φθείρει) the temple of God, this one God will destroy (φθείρει). For the

temple of God is holy, both of which (οἵτινές) you are."[286] This verse encapsulates the

dynamic of temple holiness and divine retribution which was common in the ancient

Mediterranean. Via the explanatory γάρ, Paul grounds God's actions in the holiness of

the Corinthian temple; the Corinthians are both holy and God's temple. Even though this

verse explains how God judges those who violate his temple, scholars debate how to

---

[286] I discussed by translation of this verse in chapter one.

translate φθείρει. Some advocate for "destroy" and others for "corrupt."[287] As indicated

by my translation above, I do not think that the two options are mutually exclusive.[288]

The LXX occasionally gives evidence to this in some occurrences of φθείρω (e.g., Gen.

6:11 and Hos. 9:9) where the authors closely identify the moral corruption of sin with the

bodily destruction of the sinner.[289] According to Douglas' structuralist methodology, we

should expect such a unity of meaning. Separating the two ideas would render the

holiness dynamic as unintelligible to ancient audiences.[290] For them, to cultically or

morally corrupt a holy temple invited the judgment of the divine.[291] In Paul's eyes,

community division through boasting, pride, and worldly patronage (1 Cor. 1:12; 4:6-7)

morally corrupts the temple. Because the temple is composed of persons, then this

corruption of the temple likewise corrupts the people who make up said structure. Paul

writes that the fires of the Parousia will consume all temple work (i.e., people) which is

---

[287] Scholars debate this point because they disagree as to whether or not Paul believed that God's temple could indeed be destroyed. According to some, Paul believes that the Corinthians are God's eschatological temple, which cannot be destroyed. As such, Paul must use φθείρει in order to mean "corrupt," or he means that only a portion of God's temple will be destroyed. For those who translate φθείρει as "corrupt" or "ruin" see Collins, 161; Liu, 124-127. Strack flexibly renders it as "verderben" (Strack, 224). However, others believe that the double use of φθείρει in v. 17 clarifies matters. Since the second half of the sentence must mean "destroy," then parallelism dictates that the first half must also mean "destroy." In that case, Paul believes that the destruction of God's particular temple in Corinth is indeed possible, even while God's universal temple remains forever. For those who translate φθείρει as "destroy" or "damage," see Barrett, 91; Fee, 160-161; Fitzmyer, 203; Garland, 120-121; Gärtner, 59; Käsemann, *New Testament Questions*, 65-81; Lanci, 65-68; Newton, 56; Shanor, 470-471; Weissenrieder, 410. Neither Ciampa and Rosner nor Thiselton fit into either category. They both recognize the semantic flexibility of the φθείρω and point to similar contexts in 2 Cor. where φθείρω is best understood as "to corrupt." However, in 3:17 (likely due to the continuing power of Käsemann's interpretation) they render the occurrence as "destroy" (Ciampa and Rosner, 160-161; Thiselton, 317-318). Notably, neither Engberg-Pedersen nor Martin interact with this exegetical question in their works on Paul's anthropology.

[288] Contra Harder, who distinguishes between the "real" sense, the "moral" sense, and the "ideal" sense. He identifies 1 Cor. 3:17 as an instance of the "real" sense (Günther Harder, "φθείρω," *TDNT* 9:93-106).

[289] Ibid. Harder also notes that φθείρω is equivalent to שׁחת, which means "to corrupt."

[290] Fee attempts this very thing (Fee, 161-162).

[291] Cf. Lev. 10:1-3; 1 Sam. 2:27-36; 2 Sam. 6:5-15; Hdt. 9.116-20; Xen. *Ages* 5.7.

composed of flammable material (i.e., based on the wisdom of the world). The holiness

dynamic of vv. 16-17 occurs in this context. God proactively protects the people who

form his temple by eventually destroying (φθείρει) those who morally-corrupt (φθείρει)

his saints.[292] Relationships have such a powerful transformative effect upon the

individual that immorality can be transferred from one person to the other to the degree

that cultic impurity serves as an appropriate analog; relationships can morally corrupt

individuals.[293] This is why Paul invokes the holiness dynamics of the Jerusalem temple in

which destruction is meted out to the offender.[294] Thus, in Paul's temple metaphor we see

the union of the Corinthians' vertical relationship with God and their horizontal

relationships with one another, where the two types of relationship shape the individual

for either good or for ill. By applying Douglas' structuralist model to Paul's holiness

dynamic, we see that φθείρει means both "morally corrupt" and "destroy," and thus

captures both the horizontal and vertical relationships which inform Paul's relational

anthropology.

By translating φθείρει in such a way as to capture both the material destruction of

the temple and the corruption of its sanctity, I propose in this paragraph that not only

does Paul's metaphor bear resemblance to ancient discourses of social order and ethical

cosmology surrounding temples, but his rhetorical image also highlights for the

Corinthians how they themselves are embedded in an eschatological social order opposed

---

[292] Liu understands 3:9-17 as a metalepsis of Num. 16, where Korah's division of Israel is framed in terms of moral impurity (Liu, 124-127). Cf. 1 Cor. 5.

[293] Paul regularly uses cultic purity language to describe sin and the effects of sin. For example, Paul uses ἀκαθαρσία in Rom. 1:24; 6:19; 2 Cor. 12:21; Gal. 5:19. He also uses the *hapax legomena* μολυσμός in 2 Cor. 7:1. Cf. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, *passim*.

[294] See the purity boundary markers in the Jerusalem temple as outlined in Hogeterp, 29; Wardle, 18-19.

to the chaos of sin. There are two general points to be made here regarding the temple as a symbol in the ancient world. First, the Hebrew scriptures regularly identify righteousness and salvation with God's creation order,[295] a point articulated by later thinkers through their temple theology. [296] [297] Second, temples and temple purity likewise represented a cohesive, divinely-inspired social order, the violation of which invited divine retribution.[298] Paul unites these two ideas in his temple symbolism. Recall two points I have already made. In chapter one of this thesis, I reflected on the theme of the temple as the permeable boundary between heaven and earth. In chapter two of this thesis, I argued that Paul described the Corinthians as a new creation in 1 Cor. 1:28 by virtue of their relationship with Christ, and that factionalism undermined this reality and

---

[295] H. H. Schmid, "Creation, Righteousness, and Salvation: 'Creation Theology' as the Broad Horizon of Biblical Theology," in *Creation in the Old Testament*, ed. Bernhard W. Anderson (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984), 102-117.

[296] As quoted in Davies, 129, the author of 2 Baruch 3:7 contemplates the threat of Jerusalem and the temple's destruction and, equating it the formlessness prior to God's creating all things, exclaims, "Or will the universe return to its nature and the world go back to its original silence?" Davies writes, "For Baruch, since the temple is a microcosm, the threat of its destruction is a threat that involves the entire universe."

[297] For example, Ben Sira 50:25-26 describes those who worship at the temple complex of Mt. Gerizim as "not even a people," as opposed to Israel which is a people (γένος) (New American Bible Revised Edition). In study that opens up further avenues for discussing God's relational presence with his people, Knoopers posits that the Jerusalem loyalists and the Mt. Gerizim schismatics had a different understanding of God's promise to be present among his people. See Gary N. Knoopers, *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2013), 178-212. For discussion on the sources for Mt. Gerizim and the destruction of its temple complex, see the discussion in Wardle, 114-120. For a discussion of Judaism as an ethnic inheritance, see Barclay, *Jews in the Meditterranean Diaspora*, 402-413.

[298] The Romans in particular conflate the social order with temple symbolism. See Lennon, 100-104. Orlin writes, "A new temple furthered the interests of the state by solidifying the *pax deorum*. It offered public recognition of the role of the gods in supporting and protecting the Roman state, and represented a communal giving of thanks for success" (Orlin, 190). Parker writes that murder or kin-killing in the Greek city-states destroyed the order of both the family and the body politic. This violation of community order polluted the entire πόλις and drew the negative attention of the city's divine patron in the form of plagues. The punishment for this was often exile, which the Greeks understood as a form of purification (Parker, 114; 280). The *Letter of Aristeas* explicitly invokes these ideas to explain the Levitical purification laws (139-145). Cf. Josephus, *Against Apion* 2.17, 24; Philo, *Special Laws* 1.15-16; Mary Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000), 142-149. Cf. Hogeterp, 65-66.

introduced death into the community. The metaphorical temple intensifies that concept

because the symbolism is not centered upon a building proper but upon the people who

form the metaphorical building, who themselves represent the order of new creation

inaugurated by Christ. The permeable boundary between heaven and earth in some

respects is located in the Christian people, who form God's temple by virtue of their close

association with God's Spirit.[299] Therefore, those who teach according to the world's

wisdom assault the social order of God's new creation by morally corrupting (φθείρει)

the embodiment of the heavenly order: the Christian people who make up the temple.[300]

God brings about the realization of this heavenly order in part by removing the false

workers.[301] This is important for our understanding of Paul's relational anthropology in

his temple metaphor because it captures the impact of relationships upon the Christian

self. Not only does Paul depict the self as fundamentally shaped by relationships, but he

also depicts the self as in some sense embedded within the new creation order as it is

found in the Corinthian community. Because relationships make such an impact upon the

self, Paul depicts the new creation order as threatened by harmful relationships within the

church and therefore must be protected by God himself. Paul's depiction of the

community as holy temple opposes the chaos of sin by depicting the self as embedded

within a new creation order amidst vertical (divine) and mutually-shaping horizontal

---

[299] However, there is a caveat here. Recall that Paul depicts the temple structure as a work in progress. Therefore, even though the Corinthian community is to reflect the new creation, this will only ever be partial prior to the Parousia.

[300] Cf. 1 Cor. 6:19.

[301] This was a traditional way of thinking about creation and God's upholding of it. Schmid writes, "Whoever transgresses against this order inflicts on it objective damage that must be repaired again. The act must fall back upon the actor or otherwise be 'expiated' (Schmid, 105; 110).

(human) relationships. The temple metaphor is a reflection of Paul's thinking regarding the nature of community and the self's place within it.

In this section on Paul's relational anthropology, I applied Douglas' methodology to the temple metaphor of 1 Cor. 3:9-17 to show how Paul uses the theme of temple holiness in order to show the Corinthians the reality of the eschatological social order in which they live. Hopefully, this brings clarity the debate regarding the function of the temple metaphor within 1 Corinthians 3. Even if the Paul himself believes that the Christian community is the functional replacement for (Gärtner, McKelvey, and Newton), development from (Klinzig), or the eschatological fulfillment of (Barrett, Beale, Conzelmann, Strack) the Jerusalem temple, this does not fit the rhetorical purpose of his discourse. Likewise, even if elsewhere in his letters Paul uses temple terms to redefine the Gentiles' relationship to salvation and Judaism (Horn, Fredricksen), this notion is not at the forefront of 1 Corinthians. As others have noted, Paul's theological argument in the letter restricts how the metaphor may be interpreted: Paul uses a powerful image (Lanci, Wardle) or a normative model (Hogeterp) which helps him to call the community to holiness (Bonnington, Ciampa and Rosner, Garland, Thiselton). At the same time, Paul's use of temple symbolism invokes (both implicitly and explicitly) ancient Mediterranean notions of ritual and moral purity (Liu, Suh). This means that the temple metaphor is an additional avenue for exploring Paul's anthropology (Harrington, Weissenrieder). By using Douglas' theories as my primary methodological approach, I aimed to demonstrate that Paul uses the temple as a metaphor for community holiness precisely because it symbolizes his relational anthropology. The temple shows the Christian self as necessarily constituted in relationships, which is why righteous behavior

is so important within the Corinthian community. When Paul declares that the Corinthians must watch their behavior because the holiness dynamic of a temple is at work within their community, he shows his own understanding of the self as morally formed through the interplay of both human and divine relationships. Thus, Paul envisions the Christian community as a mirror to the heavenly order in some respects, an order which is so morally affected by relationships that God protects it by destroying those who threaten it. This sharpens our understanding of the metaphor's function. Paul uses the temple to call the community to holiness precisely because it is an image which reflects his anthropological presupposition: the self is formed through relationships and embedded in an eschatological community.

The Embodied Christocentric *Habitus*

In the second section of this chapter, I will turn from the temple metaphor as a reflection of the socially-embedded aspect of Paul's anthropology and I will instead focus on how the metaphor as a picture of the embodied nature of the relational self within this eschatological social order. I will continue to apply Douglas' model. Doing this will touch upon the theology of the body, especially with the respective theologies espoused by Barclay, Engberg-Pedersen, and Martin. Both Barclay and Engberg-Pedersen build upon the anthropology of Käsemann and the social theory of Pierre Bourdieu when they describe Paul's embodied theology as a *habitus*. Barclay quotes Bourdieu in describing a *habitus* as "a system of lasting, transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a *matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and*

actions and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks."[302] The tasks

in view are the ethical actions of the Christian. For both Barclay and Engberg-Pedersen,

the *habitus* and the relationships which form it are embodied in the individual (expressed

as σῶμα in Paul's discourse).[303] Where the two scholars differ is in in their respective

understandings of how the embodied *habitus* changes. For Barclay, the change occurs via

a relationship with God established through the Christ-event.[304] Engberg-Pedersen

believes that transformation of the embodied *habitus* occurs through the infusion of a

cognitive and material pneuma (a material he defines along Stoic lines).[305] While Martin

does not use the term *habitus*, he does describe the individual body as an instance of the

social body.[306] Like Engberg-Pedersen, he ascribes positive change to participation in a

material, heavenly pneuma. Unlike Engberg-Pedersen, Martin locates negative change

through participation in the other "lower" elements which form the human body,[307] and

thus Paul's ethical thought operates according to the logic of an invasion of these

materials, which are in conflict with the heavenly pneuma.[308] In this section, my

understanding of the embodied Christian *habitus* will align with Barclay. I will apply

Douglas' methodology and make three points regarding the temple *habitus*. First, I will

---

[302] Barclay, *The Gift*, 506.

[303] Barclay, *The Gift*, 506-507; Engberg-Pedersen, 139-144.

[304] Barclay, *The Gift*, 508-519. Here, Barclay directly acknowledges that he is going beyond the material determinism of Bourdieu (507).

[305] Engberg-Pedersen, 70-72, 147-155.

[306] Martin, 37.

[307] Ibid, 132.

[308] Ibid, 168-179.

briefly exegete 6:12-19 in order to demonstrate that the metaphor of "body as temple"

should be understood as implicit in the metaphor of "community as temple" in 3:9-17.

Second, I will interact with scholars who believe that 3:9-17 should not be read in tandem

with 6:12-19. This will allow me to propose that the temple metaphor of 3:9-17 depicts

an embodied Christian *habitus* that is relationally constituted. Third, I will suggest that

that the relationally-embodied *habitus* as depicted in the temple metaphor is profoundly

Christological, in that the self is transformed through Christ-relationships. Through these

points, I will use Douglas' methodology to argue that Paul understands the Christian

body to be transformed by relationships, the chief of these being the Spirit-created

relationship with Christ.

In this paragraph, I will exegete the temple metaphor of 1 Cor. 6:19 in

order to argue that the Pauline notion of community-as-temple in 3:9-17 cannot be

divorced from the individual-body-as-temple of 6:19, and thus the embodied Christian

habitus 6:19 must inform our understanding of 3:9-17. Contrary to scholars who argue

that 3:16-17 should be read separately from Paul's temple metaphor in 6:19,[309] the

application of Douglas' methodology to the rhetorical structure of 3:16-17 suggests

otherwise. As I argued in chapter one of this thesis, the οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι clause in 3:16 is a

rhetorical marker that indicates an important theme which will be developed throughout

the letter. We find this same rhetorical indicator in 6:19, where Paul identifies the

individual bodies of the Christian as a temple of God's Spirit (ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα

---

[309] Collins, 249; Conzelmann, 76-77, 112-113; Fee, 157-162, 291-292; Fitzmyer, 203-204, 269-270; Hogeterp, 341; Lanci, 125, 128; Thiselton, 315-316.

ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός ἐστιν οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ).[310] While there is much

that could be said of 6:19, my purposes here are extremely limited. I only want to make

two points regarding 6:19, points which I argue ought to be understood within 3:9-17.

First, Paul frames his temple imagery around the reality of the resurrection and the

Corinthians' embodied relationship with Christ.[311] In 6:12-15, Paul quotes a slogan of

one of the Corinthian factions[312] and reminds his readers that they should avoid sexual

immorality. In 6:13, 20, he grounds this ethical prohibition in the fact that the Lord owns

their bodies.[313] In Paul's mind, this divine ownership is closely connected to the

resurrection (indicated by the connective conjunction δέ in v. 14). Just as God raised

Christ's body so too will he raise all Christian bodies "by his power (διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως

αὐτοῦ)," a phrase which invokes God's power of creation and new creation.[314] Using yet

another οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι clause to both intensify his argument and demonstrate the

development of the theme of 3:16-17, Paul asks his readers, "Do you not know that your

---

[310] I understand the phrase τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν as a distributive genitive. For an excellent discussion of the issue, see Gupta, "Paul Beyond the Individual/Communal Divide," 518-536. Cf. Timothy Radcliff, "'Glorify God in Your Bodies': 1 Cor. 6, 12-20 as a Sexual Ethic," *New Blackfriars* 67 [1986]: 312.

[311] My argument is very similar to Harrington's (Harrington, 340-345), and this is an indicator that Paul does not separate the self from the body (Contra Garland, 237-238).

[312] Paul is almost undoubtedly quoting the Corinthians themselves. Conzelmann states that "the way in which [Paul] introduces this statement leads us to the assumption that it was known and used in Corinth" (Conzelmann, 108). Because Paul immediately limits the quote suggests that Paul recognizes the statement but disagrees with its content (Conzelmann, 109). Mitchell concurs with this conclusion. The statement's abrupt introduction strongly suggests that it is a Corinthian quote rather than a Pauline statement (Mitchell, 232). Fee does not believe it matters whether or not the slogan originally came from Paul, seeing as he qualifies it so as to practically negate it (Fee, 251-252). Consequently, arguments stating that Paul is using the paradigmatic "I" are not convincing (Brian J. Dodd, "Paul's Paradigmatic 'I' in 1 Corinthians 6.12," *JSNT* 59 [1995]: 39-58).

[313] Cf. 1 Cor. 3:23. Because the logic of redemption undergirds this passage with God as the new master of the body (Thiselton, 475-479), I translate the dative nouns in the phrase τὸ δὲ σῶμα οὐ τῇ πορνείᾳ ἀλλὰ τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ὁ κύριος τῷ σώματι as datives of possession (Wallace, 149-151).

[314] Walter Grundmann, "δύναμις" in *TDNT*, 2:294-295.

bodies are members of Christ (τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἐστιν)?" Using the

holiness of Christ's body as a governing ideal for Christians,[315] Paul closely associates

Christian bodies with Christ's body in choosing the word μέλη, which means "body

parts."[316] Thus Paul, by combining God's power with the imagery of the Christian bodies

being members of Christ, locates God's power of new creation as at work in the

Christian's body.[317] How does this new power manifest itself in the body? This brings me

to my second point. In accordance with Rabens' model[318] Paul's rhetoric shows that this

new creation power is relationally (rather than materially) mediated by the Spirit.[319] We

see this with Paul's three-fold use of the οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι clause in 6:12-19 and his citation

of Gen. 2:24. The final οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι is crucial to this point. By using this phrase three

times in such a short section, Paul is doing more than expressing his exasperation;[320] Paul

is using diatribe to rhetorically build upon the same theme about relationships and the

---

[315] Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 142.

[316] BDAG, 628. Mitchell notes that this was a common word in speeches which argued for political unity using the imagery of the body politic. Mitchell writes, "The individualistic consequences of the body metaphor for the community, that a companion is a limb of one's own body, is also common in political texts, as in Plutarch's *De fraterno amore*" (Mitchell, 119). At the same time, as Suh rightly notes,Paul does not explicitly call the Corinthians σῶμα Χριστοῦ (Suh, 28-29).

[317] Morna D. Hooker, "'The Sanctuary of His Body: Body and Sanctuary in John," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 39, no. 4 (2017): 349-351.

[318] Rabens, 135.

[319] Cf. Engberg-Pedersen, 170-171. Engberg-Pedersen's reading of 1 Cor. 6:19 is controlled by his understanding of 1 Cor. 15, in which he argues that the resurrected body is constituted via pneumatic material (14). With this in mind, he writes of 6:19, "For our purposes it unmistakably shows that the temple of which Paul speaks consists of the single body that is made up of the individual bodies of the Corinthians as transformed by the pneuma." His reading collapses the individual body into the corporate body. However, this reading presupposes a material pneuma based on 1 Cor. 15, a view which Rabens has shown to be untenable (Rabens, 86-96). Paul's relational reading makes room for the interplay between the individual and the corporate.

[320] Contra Ciampa and Rosner, 258; Thiselton, 316, 465-474.

body, with the final clause functioning as the climax to his argument.[321] This theme develops as follows along the οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι clauses: (1) the bodies of individual believers are members of Christ, (2) one's body is united to a prostitute via sex, and (3) the body of a believer is a temple of God's Spirit (οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός ἐστιν), and as such belongs to God rather than to the world. Both Rabens' study of Pauline pneumatology and my own study of temple symbolism in the preceding chapters show that the Spirit's temple presence is a relational presence rather than a material presence. Therefore, when Paul describes the body of the believer as a temple of God's Spirit in 6:19, this should likewise be understood as a relational presence. This conclusion acts as the climax of Paul's argument in this pericope. This climax in Paul's argument informs the points in his discourse in 6:12-19 when he talks about the Christian body – his body talk is relational. This supposition is confirmed by Paul's quotation of Gen. 2:24 in v. 16, which serves to clarify clause (2) and reveals that he has relational loyalty in mind when describing union with a prostitute. He writes in 6:16, "Do you not know that he who is united (ὁ κολλώμενος) to the prostitute is one body with her? For it says (φησίν), 'The two will be as one flesh[322].'" With regards to Gen. 2:24, most scholars agree that the phrase "the two will become as one flesh" is a relational formula used to describe the relational unity of a married couple, not the formation of an ontologically-identical single being through the sexual act.[323] Paul echoes

---

[321] Collins, 242; Fee, 266; Garland, 224-226.

[322] Σάρξ should not be understood in a dualistic, cosmological sense here. Rather, "the sense is anthropological and neutral" (Conzelmann, 111).

[323] For example, see Gordan J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, Word Biblical Commentary (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1987), 68, 71; Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 2nd ed., trans. John J. Scullion (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1987), 232-233.

the Pentateuchal ideal of relational unity signified by sex.[324] Sex with a prostitute

signifies relational unity with one of the principle representatives of the world's wisdom

and as such represents an act of secession from Christ's ownership and purposes.[325] As

such, relational unity is in view in this passage. Just as Christians are relationally united

to Christ by the Spirit to the degree that they can be called "Christ's members," so too

does sex relationally unify a person with a prostitute to the degree that they can be called

one body with a prostitute. Such relational unity with a prostitute contradicts the power of

new creation in the temple-bodies of Christians (6:12), a power relationally mediated by

God's Spirit.[326] In summary, Paul in 1 Cor. 6:12-19 uses temple imagery to show how the

believer's relationship with Christ is embodied, and the power of new creation is

relationally experienced in the Christian body by the Holy Spirit. This begins to sound

similar to what I argued in chapter two of this thesis: Paul's temple imagery depicts the

self as existing on an apocalyptic spectrum, in which one end represents the

---

[324] He does so explicitly by quoting Gen. 2:24 and implicitly by describing a man's visit to a prostitute using the verb προσκολλάω, which was the Greek equivalent to דָּבַק. Just as BDB defines דָּבַק as "figurative of loyalty, affection etc., sometimes with idea of physical proximity retained" (BDB, 179), so too does BDAG define προσκολλάω as meaning "to be faithfully devoted to" when applied to the realm of human relationships (BDAG, 881). Προσκολλάω is used only occasionally with an explicit sexual connotation (Karl Schmidt, "κολλάω, προσκολλάω," *TDNT* 3:822-823). Thus, Paul sees a deep relational reality being played out in a sexual encounter with a prostitute. See the discussion in Aaron W. White, "Pauline Rhetoric Revisited: On the Meaning of κολλώμενος in the Context of 1 Cor 6,12-20," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 90, no. 4 (Dec 2014): 751-759.

[325] Paul describes this Frankenstein-esque image in v. 15: "Do you not know that your bodies are members (μέλη) of Christ? Shall I take away the members of Christ and make them members (μέλη) of a prostitute? May it not happen!" Martin correctly notes that Paul sees Christians as representatives of God's eschatological kingdom, while those outside of the church represent the kingdom of the world. He writes, "The Christian man penetrating a prostitute constitutes coitus between two beings of such different ontological status that Paul can hardly contemplate the consequences" (177). However, Martin overreaches when he writes, "Since her body is also only part of a larger whole, the cosmos, the simple act of copulation between a man and a woman becomes for Paul copulation between Christ and the cosmos" (176). Such a statement ignores the fact that αἴρω means "to snatch and carry off" (Thiselton, 465).

[326] Cf. Rom. 8:11. Rabens, 203-237.

"nothingness" of sin and the other end represents full maturity in Christlikeness and new creation (or, in the case of 6:12-19, resurrection). Where the self sits upon the spectrum depends on its relationship with both apocalyptic powers and humans. What 6:19 adds to this picture is the *embodied* reality of these relational forces. Given the thematic parallelism of 3:9-17 and 6:12-19 and their parallel rhetorical development indicated by the οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι clauses, I propose that the temple symbolism of 6:19 should be read back into the temple metaphor of 3:9-17 as we develop Paul's relational understanding of the self. Doing so honors their thematic and rhetorical parallelism and shows how the holiness dynamic of 3:16-17 is expressed in the life of the Christian community: through the embodied *habitus*.

When we do this and apply Douglas' methodology, Paul's temple metaphor of 3:9-17 not only embeds the embodied self in the eschatological social order of the Christian community, it also depicts the self as distinctly embodied. Many scholars are hesitant to identify the individual temple-bodies of 6:19 as present *in nuce* in the communal temple of 3:16-17. There are three reasons for this: (1) their understanding of the structure of Paul's metaphor prevents it,[327] (2) they believe doing so detracts from the communal focus of the pericope (in the manner exhibited by Harrington, and Weissenrieder),[328] or (3) because they believe the themes of 3:9-17 and 6:12-19 are too divergent for a mutually-informed reading.[329] Regarding the first objection, I argued in chapter one of this thesis that the entire temple metaphor spans 3:9-17 and that Paul

---

[327] Fee, 157-162, 291-292.

[328] Harrington, 325-332; Weissenrieder, 377-411. For the scholars who fall into this second category, see Böttrich, 419-420; Collins, 249; Fitzmyer, 203-204, 269-270; Strack, 251; Thiselton, 315-316.

[329] Conzelmann, 76-77, 112-113; Hogeterp, 341; Lanci, 125, 128.

depicts the temple as composed of people in a manner reminiscent of the Petrine phrase "living stones." Therefore, when we understand the corporate temple of 3:9-17 as containing the individual temple-body *in nuce*, we honor both the structure of the metaphor and identify a concept already native to the passage. Regarding the second objection, I argued in chapter two of this thesis that the passage is concerned about both the individual and the community; the two are intertwined. Therefore, the individual temple metaphor does not detract from the communal temple metaphor. Finally, by way of answering the third objection, my previous paragraph shows that the themes of the two pericopes are closely related.[330] With these objections answered, 3:9-17 reveals two striking anthropological features. First, Paul's relational anthropology as suggested by his temple metaphor depicts an embodied Christian *habitus* similar to the concept proposed by Barclay.[331] We see this in the construction imagery of the person-constituted temple as discussed in the previous two chapters. Christian workers labor upon the Corinthian temple by building up individual Christians through the wisdom of the cross. Promoting the wisdom of the world on the other hand prevents individual Christians from growing and likewise prevents the community from developing further. When we read this metaphor in light of 6:19, we see that the community-as-temple is composed of bodies-as-temple. Building up the Christian temple requires instilling the wisdom of the cross as a *habitus* in the Christian, who then embodies this reality in the eschatological temple community. Not only does the Christian self exist on an apocalyptic spectrum determined

---

[330] Because Liu exegetes both pericopes with an eye towards Douglas' methodology, his exegesis of 6:12-19 reaches similar conclusions as my own exegesis of the passage. However, his exegesis of 3:9-17 reflects a strictly communal understanding of the passage without the embodied aspects of 6:12-19 (Liu, 120-127, 145-173).

[331] See the discussion above.

by vertical and horizontal relationships, but that relational self-on-a-spectrum cannot be separated from the embodied life of the Christian within the community. Therefore, through his metaphor Paul depicts the very body of the Christian self as deeply shaped by relational[332] forces.[333] We see this later in the epistle as Paul writes about bodily matters and the importance of glorifying God "in your body": incest as defiling the community (5:1-12), court cases (6:1-8), prostitution (6:12-20), sex in marriage (7:1-24), and food (8:1-13).[334] Second, because the temple construction is not complete until the Parousia, neither will the embodied Christian *habitus* be completed until Christ's return when the temple community is judged/purified (οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός). The work begun in the present age by God and continued by the workers will be completed in the next age. What an embodied Christian *habitus* looks like in the next age is unclear (despite scholarly attempts to define it), and Paul himself will later describe it as a mystery in 1 Cor. 15:51.[335] However, the temple metaphor of 3:9-17 combined with the farming imagery of 1 Cor. 15:42-44 show that the eschatological Christian body is *in some way* relationally shaped in the present age. In light of these conclusions, reading Paul's temple metaphor in 3:9-17 as already containing the body theology of 6:12-19 reveals that he

---

[332] Contra Engberg-Pedersen (142-144, 177-179) and Martin (129-136) who both see the Christian *habitus* as shaped by material forces. Engberg-Pedersen gives priority to the cognitive element of Paul's thought, but since he understands Paul to share assumptions with Stoicism, the cognitive pneuma is distinctly material.

[333] Cf. Barclay, *The Gift*, 508. Barclay writes, "This commitment [to instantiate a new embodied *habitus*] could never be a solo affair: while the body is individual, it is also shaped in and by its social interaction."

[334] I suspect that pairing the holiness dynamic of 3:16-17 with the embodied reality of Paul's temple metaphor might bear further exegetical fruit when applied to passages that discuss bodily punishment. Cf. 1 Cor. 5:3-5; 11:30.

[335] Contra Martin, 123-136; Engberg-Pedersen, 169-171. They both argue that Paul understands the resurrected body as composed of material pneuma. However, Rabens has demonstrated the problems both with their handling of the background material and with their hermeneutical approaches (Rabens, 86-96).

understood the Christian self as an embodied *habitus* and therefore deeply shaped by vertical and horizontal relationships.

However, if we were to stop there we would miss the central focus of Paul's relational anthropology: applying Douglas' methodology to 3:9-17 shows that his embodied relational anthropology first depends upon Christ. This seems clear at first glance, as Paul describes Christ as the only foundation of the Corinthian temple (v. 11). However, what Paul writes in 2:16 suggests that this truth goes even deeper: "'For who knows the mind of the Lord, who instructs him?' But we have the mind of Christ (νοῦν Χριστοῦ)." This verse is further indicative of an embodied Christocentric *habitus*. In chapter two of this thesis, I argued that νοῦς described one's perceptive faculties and one's means of understanding, and that Paul uses the νοῦς Χριστοῦ as the standard by which one is to labor upon the temple structure. We can further sharpen this sense of νοῦς by describing it as moral perception that springs from an already properly-ordered moral character. Through reckoning with the purity formulation[336] of the Asclepion at Epidaurus and its subsequent proliferation throughout the Hellenistic world (in both literary sources and inscriptions),[337] classical scholars have recently noted that Hellenistic ritual purity encompasses both the body and the mind. The formula is as follows: "Pure

---

[336] Porph. *De abst.* 2.19. For a good discussion of Porphyry as a reliable transmitter of a 4th-century B.C. reality, see Ildikó Cspregi, "Bonus Intra, Melior Exi! 'Inside' and 'Outside' at Greek Incubation Ceremonies," in *Sacred Thresholds: The Door to the Sanctuary in Late Antiquity*, ed. Emilie M. van Opstall, (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2018), 115. However, some scholars abuse Porphyry by attempting to project his 4th-century philosophical interpretation of the inscription upon the Asclepion. Cf. Philippe Borgeaud, "Greek and Comparatists Reflections on Food Prohibitions," in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, eds. Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), 263-269.

[337] Chaniotis, "Greek Ritual Purity," 132. Chaniotis describes it as a standard expression at temple entrances by the first-century A.D.

must be he who enters the fragrant temple; purity means to think nothing but holy thoughts." Petrovich and Petrovich have argued that this cognitive, inner purity is central to and inseparable from Hellenistic understandings of purity, thus leading the Epidauros formulation to be widespread.[338] Because this understanding was in the cultural waters as it were, it may be helpful to see if there is a similar dynamic at play in Paul's temple metaphor.[339] In chapters one and two, I posited that the Spirit's relational presence communicated the mind of Christ to the Christian workers in their building up of the Corinthian temple. Therefore, I argued, the edification of the "living stones" of the temple depended upon understanding the world through the wisdom of the cross/the mind of Christ. However, Paul does not think that the wisdom of the cross is a natural state. On the contrary, those who live according to the world's wisdom are actively perishing (1:18-19; 2:6) and cannot see reality from God's perspective (2:7-9). Those who do see the world from God's perspective can only do so because they have first been transformed by Christ's person and work. This next observation is important: in 1:30, Paul identifies Christ himself as God's wisdom for the Corinthian Christians (ὃς ἐγενήθη

---

[338] Petrovich and Petrovich's definition of inner purity builds on cognitive religious theory and is worth quoting in full: "The ancient Greek notion of inner purity, as an explicit belief, conforms to this definition [of belief] insofar as it is a state of a cognitive system holding information in both propositional and explicit form as true (gods are observing me during ritual performance; my inner self is also accessible for divine scrutiny; the agency of the gods towards me depends on this scrutiny) in the generation of further thought (I have obtained to inner purity ~ 'think religiously correct thoughts' ~ "purify the soul' ~ 'rid my mind of badness') and behaviour (abstention from sources of inner pollution accompanied by behaviour resulting from the acquired state of inner purity ~ the pursuit of moral and religious correctness)" (Petrovich and Petrovich, 268). As is evident in this definition of inner purity, Petrovich and Petrovich have been influenced by Chaniotis' understanding of ritual as a form of communication with the divine. Behavior during the ritual reflects one's understanding of the gods and submission to their demands. They depart from Chaniotis by defining the worshipper's inward understanding and submission as "inner purity" (Petrovich and Petrovich, 35). Cf. Parker, 324.

[339] I am not suggesting that Paul was dependent upon Epidaurus. Rather, I am seeking to see whether or not a Douglas-based analysis reveals a similar embodied dynamic in Paul. Because few scholars use Douglas' methodology to analyze this passage, I am using classical scholars as conversation partners.

σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ) and then goes on to identify Christ as "righteousness and sanctification and redemption (δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμὸς καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις)" for all believers who are in Christ (δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ). Therefore, union with Christ changes one's moral ordering and gives the believer a new ability to see the world with Christ's mind, i.e. union with Christ creates an embodied *habitus* that lives out Christ's holiness. This close interplay between proper moral ordering and one's ability to properly grasp reality can be seen in the way in which the Christian workers labor upon the Corinthian temple in 3:1-17.[340] The Corinthians are still infants in Christ because the workers neither perceived reality nor labored according to the mind of Christ. As such, they continue to minister in such a way that encouraged an embodied non-Christian *habitus*, resulting in a communal order that does not reflect God's Kingdom. As such, both the community-as-temple and the body-as-temple are morally impure, thus inviting the fires of judgment/purification at the Parousia. In that way the moral "dirt" will be removed.[341] Paul directly invokes the dynamics of temple holiness in in 3:16-17 to explain this. Because the community is the holy temple with God's Spirit (the mediator of the Christ-mind)[342] relationally present there, one would expect it to be a thriving eschatological social order built up and maintained by Christians. However, the rampant

---

[340] Cf. Rom. 1:18-32.

[341] Given the close associations between the body of the individual, the Christian community, and Christ's resurrected body, this deserves further study. Matthew Thiessen opens some interesting avenues of inquiry in his study of Jesus and ritual purity. he proposes that the four Gospels depict Christ as taking ritual impurity seriously. According to Thiessen, Jesus (as the Holy One of Israel) goes on the offensive and resolves the ritual impurities of those with whom he interacts. See Matthew Thiessen, *Jesus and the Forces of Death: The Gospels' Portrayal of Ritual Impurity Within First-Century Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2020), *passim*. Given the close association in the ancient world with ritual purity, ontology, and ethics, Thiessen's approach may provide profitable points of contact with the Pauline epistles.

[342] Recall Rabens' pneumatic model in the discussion in chapter two on this point.

presence of moral impurity[343] suggests that the embodied *habitus* is being built according to the spirit of the world rather than according to the Christ mind, which in turn suggests a morally-disordered self at work in ministry. Therefore, God destroys the person who corrupts the temple through their morally-corrupt teaching that is given life in the body of the community members. By applying Douglas' structuralist methodology to Paul's temple metaphor, we have gained deeper insight into the Christocentric nature of the embodied Christian *habitus* at the heart of his relational anthropology.

I have applied Douglas' insights to Paul's temple metaphor in this final section in order to show that his relational anthropology shows the self as embodied, with ethical change occurring in Christ as a foretaste of the eschatological age. I made three points in this section. First, I interacted with the metaphor of "body as temple" as found in 6:12-19 and proposed that 3:9-17 depicts the same reality through the metaphor of "community as temple." Second, I suggested that misgivings (due to structural concerns or divergent themes) about reading 3:9-17 in tandem with 6:12-19 are misplaced. Rather, the two images cannot be separated. This enabled me to propose that Paul's temple metaphor sketches for us an embodied Christian *habitus* that is relationally constituted. Third, I highlighted the core Christocentricity of the relationally-embodied *habitus*. As such, the *habitus* as depicted in Paul's temple metaphor does not undergo change either through an infusion of cognitive-material pneuma (Engberg-Pedersen) nor by infusion of heavenly pneumatic material (Martin), but through a transformative relationship with the Christ (Barclay). By employing Douglas' methodology at these three points, I argued that the Pauline body is relationally constituted in Christ and thus the power of new creation is in

---

[343] This is indicated by the verb φθείρω in 3:17 (see chapter two).

some sense experienced in an embodied manner. In this way, we can say that Paul's body theology is distinctly relational.

Conclusion

In this chapter on Paul's temple metaphor, I employed Douglas' under-utilized structuralist approach in order to explore how the temple symbolism manages to encapsulate the embodied Christian *habitus* and embeds the self within an eschatological social order. I suggested that both the structure of Paul's temple metaphor and the temple symbolism within it serves to highlight the vertical and horizontal relationships of the community and how those relationships impact the Christian self. I then further clarified the temple metaphor of 3:9-17 using insights gleaned from 6:12-19. This revealed the outlines of an embodied Christian *habitus* in 3:9-17 which springs from Christ's person. As such, applying Douglas' methodology in new ways and with interaction from classical scholarship reveals that Paul understands the Christian self as relationally constituted, fundamentally embodied, and deeply embedded in an eschatological social order.

Conclusion

In the introduction to this thesis, I observed how Paul uses the temple metaphor in the Corinthian correspondence as a way of capturing the relational nature of the Christian life, and therefore I suggested that further study of the under-analyzed temple metaphor of 1 Cor. 3:9-17 may give us a new angle on Paul's theology of relationships and, by extension, his relational anthropology. Likewise, because the temple metaphor is one of the four main images used to describe Paul's view of the believer's union with Christ, I proposed that a better understanding of Paul's temple analogy in 3:9-17 might lead to a more full appreciation of his view. Given that this particular image (especially as it appears in 3:16-17) often receives less treatment in books on the believer's union with Christ, I determined to exegete 3:9-17 using Douglas' and Rabens' respective models to demonstrate how this metaphor encapsulates the Pauline relational self and by extension its import for Paul's view of union with Christ.

In chapter one on the metaphorical referents, I addressed debates regarding the structure of Paul's temple and the temple referent. I sided with scholars who argue that the temple metaphor begins in 3:9, ends in 3:17, and depicts the temple structure as constituted by persons. In making this argument I noted that because Paul elaborates on the theme of Christian growth in Christlike maturity within the metaphor, the temple of 3:16-17 must be the maturation of the building project of 3:9-15. Further, the temple referent must be the Jerusalem temple because (1) the construction language of 3:9-15 matches Old Testament depictions of the Mosaic tabernacle and the Solomonic temple, and (2) God's Spirit was relationally present in the Jerusalem temple. Having established the scope of the metaphor and the identity of the referent, I analyzed the constituent parts

123

of the metaphorical temple. I found that persons constituted this metaphorical temple in the following ways: (1) ἔργον in vv. 13-15 refers to the people of the Corinthian congregation, (2) the building materials in v. 12 refer to the quality of the builder's workmanship, and (3) Christ is the foundation of the temple in vv. 10-11. Because the entire passage depicted the temple as composed of persons, I argued that the cosmological significance and holiness motif of the temple imagery in vv. 16-17 indicates that the temple of the building project of vv. 9-15 is a temple building project. By clarifying the temple metaphor through this exegesis, I affirmed that Douglas' structuralist methodology and Rabens' pneumatic-relational model might help us get at the anthropological significance of the temple metaphor in 3:9-17.

In chapter two, I used Rabens' model to argue that Paul's relational anthropology as depicted in the metaphor preserves the self as a discreet entity while also showing how the self is constituted in and through relationships. I first examined how the temple metaphor depicts the community as deriving its life and unity in Christ, who himself is the only foundation. I connected this with earlier passages in 1 Corinthians to show that the self-in-community is God's act of new creation in Christ, mediated relationally by God's Spirit in a way which binds the community together in temple-like unity. Further, I argued that the temple metaphor depicts the Christian life as one of growth from the nothingness of sin towards mature Christlikeness and towards the eschaton. By analyzing the interplay between divine and human agency in the passage, I suggested that the self is initiated into this growth process by God alone and consummated by Christ alone at the eschaton. However, in the meantime, the interplay between the self and the community can either help or hinder the self's lifelong growth in Christlikeness (depending on

whether or not these relationships operate according to the Spirit-mediated wisdom of the cross). Therefore, the enduring eschatological shape of the self is in some sense relationally-determined (even if Paul leaves this as a mystery).

In chapter three, I employed Douglas' structuralist methodology (along with insights from classical scholars) to show how the motif of temple holiness structures the embodied self in Christocentric relationships. I showed how Paul's temple motif is a form of restricted code in a culture accustomed to associate temples with rituals, ritual purity, and the presence of the divine. Thus, Paul's temple symbolism embeds the self in a matrix of a single vertical relationship with God and many horizontal relationships with other believers. The Christian community is an eschatologically-oriented social order. Moreover, by labeling the Corinthians as a holy temple, Paul collapses the divide between God and the eschatological community (the opposite of a temple's typical role). This relational intensity with God heightens the need to avoid moral impurity, which has the capacity to corrupt others and release the chaos of sin into the community. Because the self is relationally-shaped, this moral corruption can destroy a member of the community and requires divine intervention to protect it, and thus partly explaining the need to teach according to the mind of Christ. In light of this, the temple metaphor not only highlights the social order in which the self is embedded, but it also implicates the moral ordering of the whole self. I examined how union with Christ fundamentally changes one's moral ordering so that the embodied self increasingly lives out Christ's holiness. I suggested that the notion of an embodied Christian *habitus* best reflects this dynamic in 1 Corinthians. Moreover, the concept of *habitus* explains how one who labors on the metaphorical temple according to the spirit of the world can harm the social order

of the eschatological community, while one who labors on the structure according to the mind of Christ further inculcates Christ in others.

In summary, this thesis has argued that the primary effect of the temple metaphor of 1 Cor. 3:9-17 within Paul's discourse is not to offer a polemic against the Jerusalem temple, but to describe the communal project of sanctification based on Paul's assumptions regarding human nature. Paul uses the image of a person-constituted temple to describe the community in part because he conceived of the Christian self as being constituted with and through relationships (both divine and human). That which can be properly described as one's self is neither inward nor independent; the embodied self is largely external and dependent.[344] As such, one's growth in Christlikeness depends upon others in the community and takes on an embodied form. The temple as a symbol for God's relational, holy presence captures Paul's relational understanding of the self and spurs both the individual and the community on toward greater holiness. Union with Christ is not only an individual reality; it is a communal one as well.

---

[344] Michael Horton, *The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims On the Way* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011), 380.

Bibliography

Achebach, Reinhard. "The Empty Throne and the Empty Sanctuary: From Aniconism to the Invisibility of God in Second Temple Theology." In *Ritual Innovation in the Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism*, edited by Nathan MacDonald, 35-53. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.

Athenaeus. Translated by Charles Burton Gulick. 7 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941-1961.

Barclay, John M. G. "'By the Grace of God I Am What I Am': Grace and Agency in Philo and Paul." In *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, edited by John M. G. Barclay and Simon Gathercole, 140-157. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

—————. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015.

—————. *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016.

—————. *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark, 1998.

—————. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996.

Barrett, C.K. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Black's New Testament Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1968.

Barton, Stephen C. "Dislocation and Relocating Holiness: A New Testament Study." In *Holiness: Past and Present*, edited by Stephen C. Barton, 193-213. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

—————. "Paul's Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth." *New Testament Studies* 32, no. 2 (1986): 225-246.

—————. "Why Do Things Move People?: The Jerusalem Temple as Emotional Repository." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 37, no. 4 (2015): 351-380.

Beale, G. K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2004.

Beard, Mary, John North, and Simon Price. *Religions of Rome*. Vol. 1, *A History.* Rev. ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Bendlin, Andreas. "Purity and Pollution." In *A Companion to Greek Religion*, edited by Daniel Ogden, 178-189. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.

Bonnington Mark. "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, 151-176. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 2004.

Borgeaud, Philippe. "Greek and Comparatists Reflections on Food Prohibitions." In *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, edited by Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan, 261-287. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013.

Böttrich, Christfried. "'Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes': Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus." In *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer, 411-423. Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Bruce, F. F. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. The New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1971.

Burger, Hans. *Being in Christ: A Biblical and Systematic Investigation in a Reformed Perspective*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009.

Butticaz, Simon. "The Construction of Paul's Self in His Writings: Narrative Identity, Social Memory and Metaphorical Truth." *Biblical Interpretation* 26, no. 2 (2018): 244-265.

Campbell, Constantine R. *Paul and Union with Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2012.

Campbell, Douglas A. *Pauline Dogmatics: The Triumph of God's Love*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2020.

Carbon, J.-M., S. Peels, and V. Pirenne-Delforge. *Collection of Greek Ritual Norms (CGRN)*. Liège, 2017-. Accessed July 13, 2022. http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be.

Charles, Robert H., ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.* 2 vols. Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1913.

Chaniotis, Angelos. "Greek Ritual Purity: From Automatisms to Moral Distinctions." In *How Purity Is Made*, edited by Petra Rösch and Udo Simon Wiesbaden, 123-139. Wiesbaden, DE: Harrassowitz, 2012.

————. "Ritual performances of divine justice: the epigraphy of confession, atonement and exaltation in Roman Asia Minor." In *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, edited by Hannah M.

Cotton, Robert G. Hoyland, Jonathan J. Price, and David J. Wasserstein, 115-153. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

—————. "Under the watchful eyes of the gods: divine justice in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor." In *The Greco-Roman East: Politics, Culture, Society*, edited by Stephen Colvin, 1-43. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Charlesworth, James H, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1983-1985.

Chester, Stephen J. *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church*. 2nd ed. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

Chow, John K. *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 1992.

Ciampa, Roy E. And Brian S. Rosner. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.

Cicero. Translated by G. L. Hendrickson et al. 29 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928-1966.

Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.

Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999.

Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by James W Leitch. Edited by George W. MacRae with James W. Dunkly. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1975.

Cspregi, Ildikó. "*Bonus Intra, Melior Exi!* 'Inside' and 'Outside' at Greek Incubation Ceremonies." In *Sacred Thresholds: The Door to the Sanctuary in Late Antiquity*, edited by Emilie M. van Opstall, 110-139. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2018.

Davies, James P. *Paul Among the Apocalypses?: An Evaluation of the 'Apocalyptic Paul' in the Context of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Literature*. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.

de Boer, Martinus C. *Galatians: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2011.

Deming, Will. *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.

Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925-1965.

Dodd, Brian J. "Paul's Paradigmatic 'I' in 1 Corinthians 6.12." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 59 (1995): 39-58.

Douglas, Mary. *Leviticus as Literature*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000.

—————. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. 2nd rev. ed. London: Routledge Classics, 2003.

—————. *Purity and Danger*. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Dunn, James D. G. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

Dunson, Ben C. "All for One and One for All: Individual and Community in Paul and Epictetus." In *Paul and the Giants of Philosophy: Reading the Apostle in Greco-Roman Context*, edited by Joseph R. Dodson and David E. Briones, 61-73. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2019.

du Toit, A. B. "Encountering Grace: Towards Understanding the Essence of Paul's Damascus Experience." *Neotestamentica* 30, no. 1 (1996): 71-87.

Eastman, Susan Grove. *Paul and the Person: Reframing Paul's Anthropology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2017.

Edelstein, Emma J. and Ludwig Edelstein. *Asclepius: Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*. 2nd ed. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Ego, Beate. "Purity Concepts in Jewish Traditions of the Hellenistic Period." In *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, edited by Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan, 477-492. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Fee, Gordon F. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Revised Edition. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *First Corinthians*. The Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

Ford, J. Massyngberde. You Are God's 'Sukkah' (I Cor. III 10-17)." *New Testament Studies* 21 (1974): 139-142.

Fredricksen, Paula. "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 2 (April 2010): 232-252.

Frevel, Christian, and Christophe Nihan, "Introduction." In *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, edited by Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan, 1-46. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013.

Gale, Herbert Morrison. *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1964.

Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003.

Gärtner, Bertil. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Gieniusz, Andrzej. "'As a Miscarriage': the Meaning and Function of the Metaphor in 1 Cor. 15:1-11 in Light of Num. 2:12 (LXX)." *The Biblical Annals* 3, no. 1 (March 2013): 93-107.

Grenz, Stanley J. *The Social God and the Relational Self: A Trinitarian Theology of the Imago Dei*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Gundry, Robert H. *Sōma in Biblical Theology With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Günther, Linda-Marie. "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, 245-260. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013.

Gupta, Nijay. "The Question of Coherence in Philo's Cultic Imagery: A Socio-literary Approach." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 20, no. 4 (2011): 277-297.

Haber, Susan. *"They Shall Purify Themselves": Essays on Purity in Early Judaism*. Edited by Adele Reinhartz. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Harrington, Hannah K. *The Purity and Sanctuary of the Body in Second Temple Judaism*. Göttingen, DE: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019.

Harris, Harriet A. "Should We Say That Personhood Is Relational?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 51, no. 2 (1998): 214-234.

Hays, Richard B. *1 Corinthians*. Interpretation. Louisiville: John Knox, 1997.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1974.

Herms, Ronald. "'Being Saved Without Honor': A Conceptual Link Between 1 Corinthians 3 and 1 Enoch 50?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29, no. 2 (Dec 2006): 187-210.

Herodotus. Translated by A. D. Godley. 4 vols. LCL. Cambridge, UK: Harvard University Press, 1925-1961.

Hogeterp, Albert L. A. *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*. Leuven, BE: Peeters, 2006.

Hollander, Harm W. "The Testing By Fire of the Builders' Works: 1 Corinthians 3.10-15," *New Testament Studies* 40, no. 1 (Jan 1994): 89-104.

Holloday, William L. *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1-25*. Edited by Paul D. Hanson. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1986.

Hooker, Morna D. "'Beyond the Things Which Are Written': An Examination of I Cor. IV. 6." *New Testament Studies* 10, no. 1 (Oct 1963): 127-132.

──────. "'The Sanctuary of His Body: Body and Sanctuary in John." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 39, no. 4 (2017): 347-361.

Horn, Frederick William. "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel." *New Testament Studies* 53, no. 2 (April 2007): 184-203.

Horsley, Richard A. *1 Corinthians*. Abingdon. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1998.

Hubbard, Moyer V. *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Jewett, Robert. *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. Leiden, NL: Brill, 1971.

Jones, O. R. *The Concept of Holiness*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961.

Josephus. Translated by Henry St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 Vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965.

Juvenal and Persius. Translated by G. G. Ramsay. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918-1965.

Käsemann, Ernst. *New Testament Questions of Today*. Translated by W. J. Montague. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1969.

——————. *Perspectives on Paul*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Mifflingtown, PA: Sigler, 1996.

Keener, Craig S. *The Mind of the Spirit: Paul's Approach to Transformed Thinking*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016.

Ker, Donald P. "Paul and Apollos – Colleagues or Rivals?" *Journal for the Study of New Testament* 22, no. 77 (July 2000): 75-97.

Kirk, Alexander N. "Building with the Corinthians: Human Persons as the Building Materials of 1 Corinthians 3.12 and the 'Work' of 3.13-15." *New Testament Studies* 58, no. 4 (Oct. 2012): 549-570.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.

Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

——————. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Klinzig, George. *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT*. Göttingen, DE: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.

Knoopers, Gary N. *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Kuck, David W. *Judgment and Community Conflict: Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5 - 4:5*. Leiden, NL: Brill, 1992.

Kwong, See Oh-Young. "A Critical Review of Recent Scholarship on the Pauline Opposition and the Nature of Its Wisdom (Σοφία) in 1 Corinthians 1-4." *Currents in Biblical Research* 8, no. 3 (2010): 386-427.

Lakeoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Lamoreaux, Jason T. "Ritual Negotiation in 1 Corinthians: Pauline Authority and the Corinthian Community." *Neotestamentica* 50 (2016): 397-422.

Lanci, John R. *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Strategy*. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.

Lennon, Jack J. *Pollution and Religion in Ancient Rome.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Linke, Bernhard. "Sacral Purity and Social Order in Ancient Rome." In *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, edited by Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan, 289-309. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013.

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1996.

Liu, Yulin. *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians*. Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Martin, Dale. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.

Marshall, I. Howard. "Church and Temple in the New Testament." *Tyndale Bulletin* 40, no. 2 (Nov 1989): 203-222.

McGlyn, Moyna. "Authority and Sacred Space: Concepts of the Jerusalem Temple in Aristeas, Wisdom, and Josephus." *Biblische Notizen* 161, (2014): 115-140.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983.

Milgrom, Jacob. "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Grey." *Revue biblique* 83, no. 3 (1976): 390-399.

————. *Leviticus: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 3 vols. Yale Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1991-2001.

Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991.

Moo, Douglas J. "Creation and New Creation." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 20, no. 1 (2010): 39-60.

Newton, Michael. *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and the Letters of Paul*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Neusner, Jacob. *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism*. Leiden, NL: Brill, 1973.

Nicklesburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*. Edited by Klaus Baltzer. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001.

Orlin, Eric M. *Temples, Religion, and Politics in the Roman Republic*. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2002.

Parker, Robert. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion.* 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. Translated by H. A. Ormerod et. al. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926-1966.

Pearson, Birger Albert. *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism*. Missoula, MT: Scholar's Press, 1973.

Peels-Matthey, Saskia. Review of *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion: Early Greek Religion*, by Andrej Petrovich and Ivana Petrovich. *Kernos* 31, no. 1 (2018): 1-5. https://journals.openedition.org/kernos/2778.

Petrovich, Andrej, and Ivana Petrovich, *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion: Early Greek Religion*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016

Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H Whitaker. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929-1981.

Poirier, John C. "Three early Christian views on ritual purity: a historical note contributing to an understanding of Paul's position." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 81, no. 4 (Dec. 2005): 424-434.

Porphyry. *Select Works of Porphyry*. Translated by Thomas Taylor. London: Thomas Rodd, 1823.

Porter, Stanley E. "Two Myths: Corporate Personality and Language/Mentality Determinism." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 43, no. 1 (1990): 289-307.

⸺. *When Paul Met Jesus: How an Idea Got Lost in History*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Proctor, John. "Fire in God's House: Influence of Malachi 3 in the NT." *Journal of the Evangelical Society* 36, no. 1 (March, 1993): 9-14.

Rabens, Volker. *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life.* 2nd Revised Edition. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 2014.

Radcliff, Timothy J. "'Glorify God in Your Bodies': 1 Cor. 6, 12-20 as a Sexual Ethic." *New Blackfriars* 67 (1986): 306-314.

Regev, Eyal. "Community as Temple: Revisiting Cultic Metaphors in Qumran and the New Testament." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 28, no. 4 (2018): 604-631.

————. *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2019.

Richardson, Philip N. *Temple of the Living God: The Influence of Hellenistic Philosophy on Paul's Figurative Temple Language Applied to the Corinthians.* Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2018.

Robertson, Archibald and Alfred Plummer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians.* International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark Ltd., 1999.

Robertson, Noel. "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, 195-244. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013.

Rosner, Brian S. "Temple and Holiness in 1 Cor. 5." *Tyndale Bulletin* 42, no. 1 (1991): 137-145.

Roubekas, Nickolas P. Review of *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion: Early Greek Religion*, by Andrej Petrovich and Ivana Petrovich. *Religious Studies Review* 44, no. 3 (Fall 2018): 332.

Saiz, Jose Ramon Busto. "¿Se Salvara Como Atravesando Fuego? 1 Cor 3,15b Reconsiderado." *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 68, no. 266 (Jul-Sep 1993): 333-338

Sanders, Boykin. "Imitating Paul: 1 Cor. 4:16." *Harvard Theological Review* 74, no. 4 (1981): 353-363.

Schmid, H. H. "Creation, Righteousness, and Salvation: 'Creation Theology' as the Broad Horizon of Biblical Theology." In *Creation in the Old Testament*, edited by Bernhard W. Anderson, 102-117. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984.

Schnelle, Udo. *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005.

Shanor, Jay. "Paul as Master Builder: Construction Terms in 1 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 34, no. 3 (1988): 461-471.

Stevenson, Gregory. *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001.

Strack, Wolfram. *Kultische Terminologie in ekklesiologischen Kontexten in den Briefen des Paulus*. Weinheim, DE: Beltz Athenaüm, 1994.

Strabo. *The Geography of Strabo*. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. 8 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932-1959.

Suh, Michael K. *Power and Peril: Paul's Use of Temple Discourse in 1 Corinthians*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020.

Tacitus. *The Histories and The Annals*. Translated by Clifford H. Moore and John Jackson. 4 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity*. Edited and translated by John H. Schütz. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1982.

Thiselton, Anthony C. "Human Being, Relationality and Time in Hebrews, 1 Corinthians and Western Traditions." *Ex Auditu* 13, (1997): 76-95.

————. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.

Thiessen, Matthew. *Jesus and the Forces of Death: The Gospel's Portrayal of Ritual Impurity Within First-Century Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2020.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.

Waterfield, Robin. Review of *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion: Early Greek Religion*, by Andrej Petrovich and Ivana Petrovich. *Heythrop Journal* 58, no. 6 (November 2017): 961-962.

Wardle, Timothy. *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*. Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Webb, Barry G. "Heaven on Earth: the Significance of the Tabernacle in its Literary and Theological Context." In *Exploring Exodus: Literary, Theological and Contemporary Approaches*, edited by Brian S. Rosner and Paul R. Williamson, 154-176. Nottingham, UK: Apollos, 2008.

Weissenrieder, Annette. "'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*, edited by David L Balch and Annette Weissenrieder, 377-411. Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Wenham, Gordan J. *Genesis 1-15.* Word Biblical Commentary. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1987.

Wenschkewitz, Hans. *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*. Leipzig, DE: E. Pfeiffer, 1932.

Westerholm, Stephen. "Paul's Anthropological 'Pessimism' in its Jewish Context." In *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*. Edited by John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole, 71-98. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*. 2nd ed. Translated by John J. Scullion. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1987.

White, Aaron W. "Pauline Rhetoric Revisited: On the Meaning of κολλώμενος in the Context of 1 Cor 6,12-20." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 90, no. 4 (Dec 2014): 751-759

Williams, H. H. Drake, III. *The Wisdom of the Wise: The Presence and Function of Scripture within 1 Cor. 1:18-3:23*. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2001.

Winter, Bruce W. *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change.* Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001.

Witherington, Ben, III. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.

Wright, N. T. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. 2 Volumes. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2013.