

Why Christian males should avoid sex with idolatrous pagan prostitutes (1 Cor 6:12-20):

¹²["For me all things are authorized/permitted["]—but not all things are beneficial!; ["For me all things are authorized/ permitted["]—but I will not be mastered/ruled by anything! ¹³["Foods for the stomach and the stomach for foods["]—but God will destroy both these and that! The **body**, however, is not for [heterosexual] **porneia-prostitution**, but for the Lord and the Lord for the **body**. ¹⁴And God both raised the Lord and through his power will also raise us. ¹⁵Don't you [pl] know that your **bodies** are members of Christ? Therefore, taking Christ's limbs and organs, shall I make [them] members of a [fem., idolatrous] **porne-harlot**? May it not be! ¹⁶Or don't you [pl] know that he who clings to a [fem., idolatrous] **porne-harlot** is one **body** [with her]? For he/it says "The two [m.+ f.] will become **one flesh**" [Gen 2:24 LXX]. ¹⁷But the one clinging/being joined to the Lord is one **spirit** [with him]. ¹⁸Flee [heterosexual] **porneia-prostitution** [see Joseph in Gen 39; cf. "flee idolatry," 1 Cor 10:14]! Whatever [other] sin that a man may commit is *outside* the **body**; but he who **commits** [heterosexual] **prostitution-pornéo** sins against his own body. ¹⁹Or don't you [pl] know that your **body** is a shrine/temple of the indwelling Holy Spirit whom you have received from God, and that you are not your own, ²⁰for you were bought with a price? So glorify/honor God in your **body**/with your **bodily life**.

How [heterosexual] Christians [m. + f.] may avoid porneia (7:1-7): ¹Now concerning the things you wrote about: ["It is good for a man not to touch [have sex with] a woman["]; ²but because of **porneia-prostitution**, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband. ³The husband should pay/fulfill his [marital] debt to his wife; and likewise also the wife to her husband. ⁴The wife has no authority over her own **body**, but the husband; and likewise the husband has no authority over his own **body**, but the wife. ⁵Don't deprive one another unless by agreement [mutual consent] for a time in order that you may have leisure for prayer and then come together lest Satan tempt you [pl.] for your [pl.] lack of self-control. ⁶Now this I say as a concession, not as a command. ⁷To be sure, I wish all men were as I am; but each has his own gift [*chaisma*] from God, one this, another that.

Note. Two roots dominate 1 Cor 6:12-20:

1. **Body** (gr. *sóma*): 8x (6:13a, 13b, 15, 16, 18a, 18b, 19, 20)—not the neo/platonic prison of the soul! Paul uses *soma* to denote the whole person, the "*interpersonal, social, public mode of being a Christian....The Christian lifestyle is more than a private 'inner' state; it manifests itself in 'bodily' action and behavior in the public domain*" (Thiselton 2006:94); related words, stomach, 6:13, 2x; members, 6:15, 3x; flesh, 6:16.

2. **Prostitution: (1) gr. pórneia:** 2x (6:13, 18a); **(2) gr. pórne,** 2x "[idolatrous, female] prostitute /harlot" (6:15, 16); **(3) gr. pornéo:** 1x, "have relations with a prostitute" (6:18); the same root a total of 5x.

1 Porneia. According to **Kyle Harper:** "Ultimately Christian understandings of *porneia* develop out of Paul's letters, especially 1 Corinthians 5–7" (JBL 2012:376-77) and "1 Corinthians 6:12-20 must be the crux of any interpretation of Pauline *porneia*" (378). However, in 1 Cor 6:12-20 Paul has not composed a rationalistic philosophical ethical exposition but a letter that uses rhetoric to persuade heterosexual Christian males not to seek out pagan (idolatrous) female prostitutes. As in all his letters, the Apostle addresses a specific historical situation: heterosexual prostitution with idolatrous pagan harlots (6:18; 10:14) and employs generalizations, even hyperbole, that should not be misinterpreted as philosophical or scientific absolutes without exceptions (7:6-7). Versions differ widely regarding the theme and most appropriate title for 1 Cor 6:12-20: NJB and NIV ("Sexual Immorality"); NRSV ("Glorify God in Body and Spirit"). Harper indicates his agreement with **Gaca's** claim that the prohibition of *porneia* marked a fundamental break with Greco Roman sexuality, but says "I significantly depart from her argument that *porneia* for Paul and the early Christians was principally religious exogamy" (2012:366, note 8, citing Gaca 2003:151). Later, commenting on Paul's reference to incest as *porneia* (1 Cor 5:1), he elaborates: "Gaca's understanding of *porneia* as religious exogamy cannot stand here...in perhaps the most important canonical usage of the term *porneia*. Paul's objection is not rooted in the woman's alien religious status. He specifies that the relationship is *porneia* insofar as (*oste*) she was the man's father's wife, and Paul evokes the LXX language of Leviticus to describe the illicit union" (2012: 377, note 63): However, in her interpretation of *porneia* in 1 Cor 5-7 (151-52) Gaca's conclusion that Paul mainly *emphasizes* religious exogamy does not constitute a negation of diversity in usage of this slippery term.

Loader 2012:169-182. Loader cites Renate Kirchhoff (1994:18-37) who concludes “that whereas the words [*porneia* and *porne*] refer to prostitution in pagan literature and are used infrequently, they have a broader compass in Jewish and Jewish Christian sources. The translation, sexual immorality, for *porneia* is appropriate and for *porne* one could include any woman who engages in sexual intercourse beyond what is permitted, including prostitutes, but not limited to prostitutes” (168 note 72).

Brian Rosner’s often neglected or misinterpreted work (1998:336-51) points to the linking of apostasy and idolatry with sexual immorality (342-45) and in particular to 1 Cor 10:7 which he argues assumes presence of prostitutes at temple meals and where the same kind of slogans of freedom occur (348-51), to 6:9-11 which also links sexual immorality and idolatry, but especially to the imagery of 6:19 (345-47). “Thus a solution to the puzzle of the historical context of 1 Cor 6:12-20 presents itself when we recognize the link between feasting and *porneia*, and note that both the Corinthian Christians who were eating in pagan temples and those who were using prostitutes were defending their behaviours with the same slogan: ‘all things are lawful for me,’ It is this: some Corinthians were attending temple feasts and using prostitutes who offered their services on such festive occasions (350).(Loader 2012:180, note 112).

Loader cites authorities who call into question or deny the existence of sacral prostitution at Corinth in the Roman period, but here (2012:180, citing pp. 24,30-31) does not seem to recognize **Rosner’s** clear distinction between such sacral or cultic prostitution (where the prostitutes constituted part of the temple cult) and ordinary prostitutes who took advantage of cultic feasts and religious celebrations as places and occasions to offer their services (2010:73 and note 40, which cites Rosner’s reference to prostitutes “linked“ to the temple as “uncertain“ but fails to note Rosner’s distinction between cultic/sacral prostitutes and others who simply took advantage of religious sites and celebrations to offer their services). In addition to Rosner’s clarification regarding the different types of temple-venue prostitution, **Ted Jennings** argues that the search for [heterosexual] *fertility cult* parallels in Canaanite religion has been fruitless, because “the *qedeshim* are indigenous to the cult of YHWH. They make whatever religious sense they make not in the framework of a fertility cult but in the context of a phallus cult, in the context of the adoration of a male deity on the part of male (and possibly also female) devotees” ((*Jacob’s Wound* 2005:126). Thus “the *qedeshim* of the southern kingdom are parallel to the *bene-hanebi’im* [sons of the prophets] of the northern kingdom” (125). David Garland (2003) includes Rosner (1998) in his bibliography but does not cite it; Thiselton (2000 and 2006) even omits it from his bibliographies. Von Thaden (2012) cites both Rosner and Fisk (208) and Fisk (253-55) but fails to cite Rosner later when relevant and calling into question his argument (257-58).

The common neglect/misinterpretation of **Rosner’s 1998** article would appear to be due to the adherence of so many to Bruce Fisk’s influential 1996 article, of which Loader says: “Fisk, ‘Body Violation,’ commenting on the use of Gen 2:24 notes that for Paul: ‘sexual sin is uniquely body-defiling because it is inherently body-joining’ (556). To violate the body is to violate God’s house (557)“ (**Loader 2012:176, note 101**). However, if Rosner is correct in identifying the prostitutes referred to in 1 Cor 6:12-20 as idolatrous and associated with pagan temples (without necessarily being temple/cult/sacral prostitutes), then Paul’s argument may reflect more the dangers of submitting oneself to idolatrous figures and not to sex or prostitution *per se*. The exhortation to “Flee/avoid *porneia*“ (6:18) may be practically equivalent to “Flee/avoid idolatry“ (10:14)

2 “One Flesh,” Brownson 32-36/38, 85-109. “The ‘one-flesh’ union spoken of in Genesis 2:24 connotes, not physical complementarity [*pace* Gagnon], but a kinship bond....’One flesh’ means ‘one kinship group.’ This is in keeping with the parallels to ‘flesh and bone’; the reference implicit in ‘one flesh’ here is not to the recovery of a mystic or primordial unity but rather to the establishment of a kinship bond....If the ‘leaving’ [of father and mother] of the first half of the verse connotes the dissolution of one primary kinship tie, the ‘one-flesh’ language at the end of the verse connotes the establishment of a new one, between husband and wife. This approach to the text is confirmed by the way Jesus himself interprets Genesis 2:24 [Mark 10:8 on divorce]....The same essential line of interpretation is found in Paul’s reference to Genesis 2:24 in 1 Corinthians 6:16-17....The focus in Genesis 2 is not on the complementarity of male and female but on the similarity of male and female [‘bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh’]” (32-38). “‘One Flesh’ in Genesis 2:18-25” (86-90); “‘One Flesh’ and Jesus’ Teaching on Divorce (90-97); “‘One Flesh’ in Ephesians 5:21-33 (87-101; marriage “‘sacramental’ in a more general sense”); “Sex and One Flesh: 1 Corinthians 6:12-20” (101-104); “Implications for the Debate over Gay and Lesbian Relationships” (104-09; cf. Galileo; slavery; women).

Bibliography: “One flesh”

- Countryman, L. William (2007). *Dirt, Greed & Sex*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 240-252.
- Gagnon, Robert A.J. (2001). *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*. Nashville: Abingdon, 292-97.
- Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995, 174-78.
- McDonald, Margaret Y. (2008). “Marriage, NT.” *The New Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*. Katherine Doob Sakenfeld, ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 812-818.
- Shields, Mary E. (2008). “Marriage, OT.” *The New Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*. Katherine Doob Sakenfeld, ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 818-21.
- Westermann, Claus (1974/84) *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*. 3 Vols. Minneapolis: Augsburg, I:233-34

Excursus: unity (“unitivity”?) + diversity (hospitality)

1 Unity (“Unitivity”?): “One flesh” (Gen 2:24; 1 Cor 6:16; Mk 10:8-9 // Mat 19:5; Eph 5:31).

Therefore a man leaves his father and mother and cleaves to his woman/wife and *they* [“the two,” LXX → Mk 10:8 // Mat 19:5; // Eph 5:31; see 1 Cor 6:16] become one flesh.

Regarding Paul’s reference to “one flesh“ (Gen 2:24) in 1 Cor 6:16, **William Loader** comments: “Here Paul cites the LXX *eis sarka mian* (‘one flesh’). While the Hebrew focuses particularly on the creation of kinship [“they“], Paul, following the LXX [+ ‘the two’] focuses more on the effects of the act of sexual intercourse in creating ‘one body’“ (2005:90-91, cited by **Anthony Thiselton**, 2006:96-97). Evangelical **Gordon Wenham** says concerning “one flesh” in Gen 2:24: “This does not mean merely

[1] the sexual union that follows marriage [Herman Gunkel 1901:10], or

[2] the children conceived in marriage [Gerhard von Rad 1972:85], or even

[3] the spiritual and emotional relationship that it involves [Franz Delitzsch 1987; **Claus Westermann** 1976/84-82/86, I:233], though all are involved in becoming one flesh [see the love that creates a spiritual unity, a more complete personal communion; Col 3:14; Eph 5:31]. Rather it affirms that

[4] just as blood relations are one’s flesh and bone [Gen 2:23], so marriage creates a similar kinship relation between man and wife. They become related to each other as brother and sister are.

“The laws in Lev 18 and 20, and possibly Deut 24:1-4, illustrate the application of this kinship-of-spouses principle to the situation following divorce or the death of one of the parties. Since a woman becomes on marriage a sister to her husband’s brothers, a daughter to her father-in-law, and so on, she cannot normally [see Levirate marriage!] marry any of them should her first husband die or divorce her...The kinships established by marriage are therefore not terminated by death or divorce” (1987:71; *Genesis 1-15*, WBC; Waco, Texas: Word). See Jesus with his beloved disciple and Mary (→ John 19:25-27), implying that Jesus and John had a one-flesh relationship that transcended death in the continuing mother-son relationship between the beloved disciple and Mary (Theodore Jennings 2003:24-28; Tom Hanks 2010:103; 2012:63).

The phrase “bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh” (Gen 2:23) “are a poetic formulation of the traditional kinship formula. For example, Laban said to his nephew Jacob, ‘You are my bone and my flesh’ (29:14); cf. Judg 9:2; 2 Sam 5:1; 19:13-14 [12-13]) (Wenham 1987:70). Moreover, as **William Countryman** points out, rather than any teaching regarding male-female differences and modern ideologies of “complementarity” Adam’s delight in the woman is grounded in her identity with him, not her difference: ‘This is now bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh’ (Gen.2:23, AV)“ (2007:242; *pace* Karl Barth and Robert Gagnon, whom he cites). Countryman also indicates that “By ‘one flesh’...Jesus understands not sexual intercourse, as Paul did..., but full kinship. The simple fact of sexual intercourse would not prohibit divorce” (2007:170; cf. Paul, p. 243). .

“And sticks [cleaves] to his wife’ [Gen. 2:24]. According to Wenham “This phrase suggests both passion and permanence should characterize marriage (1987:71). However, as **Countryman** points out, had the writers and editors of the Hebrew Bible interpreted Gen 2:24 as requiring that marriage always be permanent, they would not have included the divorce law of Deut 24:1-4, nor the demands of Ezra 10 and Neh 13 that Israelite males divorce their foreign wives (2007:243-44). Wenham adds: “Israel is repeatedly urged to stick to the LORD (Deut 10:20; 11:22; 13:5, etc.). The use of the terms ‘forsake’ and ‘stick [cleave]’ in the context of Israel’s covenant with the LORD suggests that the OT viewed marriage as a kind of covenant” (1987 71). However, although the Hebrew Bible never explicitly refers to marriage as a covenant, Jonathan is said to “be knit” to David and their relationship three times is said to be expressed in their making a covenant with one another:

(→ 1 Sam): **18:1-4**. ¹When David had finished speaking to Saul, the soul/life (*nefesh*) of Jonathan was knit (*qashar*) to the soul/life (*nefesh*) of David, and Jonathan loved (*'ahab*) him as he loved himself [see Lev 19:18,34; → Rom. 13:8-10]. ²From that day on, Saul would not let [David] return to his father's house. ³Then Jonathan made a **covenant** with David, because he loved him as he loved himself. ⁴And Jonathan stripped himself of the robe that he was wearing, and gave it to David, and he also gave him his tunic and even his sword, and, what is more, his bow and even his girdle [see their further "covenants" 20:40-41; 23:17-18].

Finally, at Jonathan's death David declared that Jonathan's love for David surpassed the love of women:

2 Sam. 1:26. "Your love (*'ahab*) for me was more delicious than the love (*'ahab*) of women" [having eight wives and ten concubines, David had considerable basis for comparison!].

Regarding 1 Corinthians 6:16 **William Countryman (2007:198)** comments:

"Sex with a prostitute might seem to establish no relationship at all beyond the brief one required for the satisfaction of desire. Paul, however, in a daring interpretation of Genesis 2:24, claimed that every sexual act between a man and a woman established a union of flesh like that of marriage, although not, apparently, indissoluble. In other words, the prostitute and the man who has used her actually belong to each other for the duration of their sexual intercourse, although not beyond. The man who rented the prostitute no doubt thought of this 'ownership' as being entirely on his side. No so, according to Paul; he also becomes her property and makes his body part of hers. In Paul's own terminology the relationship thus established is 'one body', but in the terminology of Genesis, it is a relationship of 'one flesh.' For Paul 'flesh' referred not to the whole person but to what in us resists God, so he could also argue that the union created by an isolated sexual act is animated by 'flesh' and therefore pulls one away from God. The believer's bodily union with Christ, on the other hand, is not 'one flesh,' but 'one spirit.' That is to say, it is animated by the principle that draws one toward God."

2 Diversity (Hospitality). **B.N. Fisk** says of 1 Cor 6:12-20: "Paul grounds his prohibition of sexual immorality [*porneia*] in three distinct but closely related arguments ...related respectively to Christ violation [vv. 15], body-violation [16-18] and Spirit violation [19-20]" and because intercourse with a prostitute is "uniquely body joining, it is uniquely body-defiling" (**1996:557-58**). Paul perceived the sexual act "as one of intimacy and *self-commitment which involved the whole person*, not the mere manipulation of some 'peripheral' function of the body" and thus was far ahead of first-century cultural assumptions (**Thiselton 2000:474**, citing D.S. Bailey 1959:9-10). David **Garland** adds: "In the context, sex with a prostitute severs the union with Christ and sabotages its resurrection destiny" (**2003:238**)

However, nothing in the context of Genesis 2:24 would indicate the "one-flesh" relationship between Adam and Eve established an ethical norm of exclusivity. Later in the same book the patriarchs Abraham and Jacob had concubines and multiple wives, and Jacob's taking Rachel as a second wife, after being tricked by Laban into marrying her older sister Leah, is narrated approvingly (→ 1-2 Kings on concubines and polygamy). Similarly, today, someone tricked by religious leaders into a heterosexual marriage to "cure" their homosexual orientation might eventually enter into a same-sex relationship/marriage, that (as in the case of David and Jonathan with their previous marriages) would more authentically fulfill their need for a loving "one-flesh" relationship. Nor does Genesis 2:24 establish life-long marriage an ethical absolute: The Hebrew reference to "they" becomes "the two" in the LXX. Jesus' citation of Gen 2:24 (LXX) in his teaching on divorce (→ Mk 10:8-9 // Mat 19:5) does not condemn all divorce, since he recognizes exceptions (Mat 19:9; Paul provides another, 1 Cor 7:15).

"The way Paul deals with *porneia* is soaked in the logic of pollution and invasion. This is sexual immorality that involves a member of the church and an outsider. How Paul would have dealt with fornication (that is, sexual intercourse between unmarried persons not involving adultery on either side) within the church is unknown since he nowhere addresses the subject in his letters. Doubtless he would have disapproved, but he appears not to have considered it a very real possibility....The logic of invasion...applies to sexual intercourse only when one partner is outside the body of Christ. When two Christians commit fornication, there seems to be little danger that the body of Christ is implicated in copulation with the world. Copulation that crosses the boundary of the body of Christ, on the other hand, implicates Christ's body in coitus with the cosmos and makes the entire body dangerously susceptible to pollution and dissolution" (**Dale Martin 1995:179**)

Inductive Study, 1 Corinthians 6:12-20

6:12 How does 6:12-20 relate to its context? See 5:1-13 y 7:1-40; 6:1-11. In 6:12 is Paul citing two of the Corinthians' maxims/ slogans? and what did they mean? See NJB note 6:12 g and cf. 8:9 and 10:23.

6:13-14 Does 6:13 cite another of their maxims/slogans? Cf. 8:8. How did the Corinthian believers understand the meaning of sexual relations? Is a similar materialist interpretation common among us today? With what arguments does Paul respond to the reductionist maxims/slogans? See 6:13, 14, 15-16, 17, 18, 19, 20. Does Paul agree with the maxim/slogan in 6:13? **Note.** Fee (255) agrees that sex and food have something in common, but says Paul emphasizes the differences: food is a *thing*; but sexual relations are between *persons* created in God's image with spiritual implications and consequences. See NJB note 6:14 h.

6:15 Does 6:15 refer to the religious prostitution (idolatry) common in pagan fiestas and/or fertility cults common in pagan temples? See 6:19-20; 10:7-8, 14 (with 6:18).

6:16 How does Paul understand "one flesh" in Gen. 2:24 LXX, which he cites?

6:18 "Flee porneia"; see 2 Tim. 2:22; Gen. 39:12; cf. 1 Cor. 10:14, "Flee idolatry." How should we interpret Paul's affirmation that "Whatever [other] sin that a man may commit is outside the body; but he who commits [heterosexual] *porneia*-prostitution sins against his own body" (6:18). The Word "other" of the NIV is not in the original text, but in the Greek sometimes is only implicit (Mat 12:31; cf. NRSV). What would Paul say, then, of the person who is drunk/alcoholic (6:10; 5:11); see gluttony, drugs, cigarettes, suicide, etc.; Phlp. 3:19.

6:19 Who represents the image of the Temple here—the individual? Or the Christian community? (as in 3:16; 12:12-30; 2 Cor. 6:16; with Christ the "head" in Col 1:18; 2:19 or the corner stone in Eph. 2:20-22).

6:20 What are the characteristics of the slave market reflected here? Does the change in ownership result in freedom? See 7:22; Gal. 3:13; 4:5; Rev. 5:9; 14:3. "Glorify God..." (see Mat 5:14-16; Rom 1:21, 23; 15:6, 9; 2 Cor 9:13; Gal 1:24). Does praise complete the enjoyment? (WCF and Shorter Catechism Q.1).

Limited Horizons?

1. Paul's warning to Corinthian males/husbands tempted to visit idolatrous female prostitutes gives the impression of despising prostitutes as persons (6:15-16). Is Paul's attitude toward prostitutes coherent with the Hebrew Bible (Tamar, Gen. 38; Rahab, Jos. 2 with James 2:25 and Hebrews 11:31; Hos 1-3) and with Jesus' example and teaching? See Rahab in his genealogy in Mt 1:5; cf. Mt 21:31-32.

2. Is 1 Cor 6:18 simply hyperbole? Does it fail to take into account other sins committed against our bodies? **Bruce Fisk** affirms that 1 Cor 6:18: "declares sexual sin to be profoundly (and even uniquely) self-destructive....Sexual sin, as a bodily act...forges a bodily union....Other sins may be physically destructive (e.g. suicide, gluttony), corporately destructive (e.g. gossip, divisiveness), or spiritually defiling (e.g. idolatry) but for Paul, because sexual sin is uniquely body-joining, it is uniquely body-defiling" (1996:557-58; cited, **Gagnon 2001:296**).

3. Could the logic of 6:16-17 also be used to eliminate marriage and all sexual relations?

4. If all sex must be limited to permanent, exclusive marriage, how should we evaluate the levirate practices, concubines, polygamy, masturbation, etc.?

5. How should contemporary medical and scientific perspectives (psychology, sociology, economics) contribute to our sexual ethics?

6. If *ágape*-love is fundamental for all of life and especially for Christian sexual praxis (1 Cor. 13), then why does Paul fail to refer to love in 1 Cor. 5-7? See. 7:3-5 and the couple's eager desire to please one another (7:33-35); cf. Eph. 5:25-35. In 1 Cor 5-7 does Paul substitute "holiness" (purity) for love as the basis of marriage and sexual praxis (see 6:19)? How would you relate these two norms for human sexuality?

Permanente Values for the church in Paul's teaching:

1. Paul's critique of the reductionist "sex = food" analogy (cf. likenesses + *differences*).

2. The eternal significance of our bodies and their ethical-moral acts in the light of (a) our creation in God's image (13b + the Hebrew Bible, Gen 1-2; Psalm 104); (b) our redemption (19-20); the resurrection (14);

3. Prostitution as an institution generally is condemned as incompatible with God's Kingdom, which faults it as: (a) a system of exploitation, violence and domination of prostitutes; but cf. 6:18; (b) tending to promote impersonal sexual relations, lacking love (6:12; 7:4); treating other persons as things (like food).

4. Such sexual acts may establish relations between humans and idolatrous spiritual “powers” that transcend the purely physical (6:16; Gn.2:24; Fee 1987:253; Martin 1995:176-77; Garland 2003:233).

5. The development of a sexual praxis in a positive context of love (1 Cor.13) and the resurrection of the body (1 Cor.15); the rejection of idolatry (1 Cor.8-10) as the ideology of oppressors (especially empires).

6. The (imperfect) analogy between God or Christ (Eph. 5) in relation to the believer (or the church) and the ethical ideal of a sexual relation that is exclusive and permanent (6:13, 15-17; 7:1-4). This ideal commonly is promoted as a norm, but should we accept this common tradition and interpret it an “absolute law”?

7. The Christian’s body belongs to our resurrected Lord (13c, 15^a, 17) and should glorify God (20).

Conclusions Fee (1987:266) proposes two basic applications:

1. Against contemporary sexual failures, “Sexual immorality is still sin, even though it has been justified under every conceivable rationalization....Our bodies belong to God through the redemption of the cross; and they are destined for resurrection.”

2. Greek dualism “would negate the body in favor of the soul....In the Christian view there is no dichotomy between body and spirit that either indulges the body because it is irrelevant or punishes it so as to purify the spirit.” Fee concludes that such a dichotomy is reflected in the tendency of those who would “save souls” while ignoring people’s material needs. See 1 John. 3:16-18; James. 2:14-17.

Which elements in Paul’s argument are of greatest permanent value for Christian theology and contemporary sexual ethics? Does the text contain other elements of limited historical (contextual) value but which we cannot accept literally in their original form as universally valid today? How would a poor secular prostitute (not idolatrous) react to Paul’s teaching in 6:12-20 today? Could this text be of help in sharing Jesus’ Good News with prostitutes? Or would it only be helpful for a church that included no prostitutes? **Which elements in Paul’s address to [heterosexual] Christian males seeking idolatrous, pagan harlots might be applicable to same-sex (non-hierarchical) exchanges of sex for pay/material reward (a place to live, as in marriage)?**