

A BIBLICAL RESTORATIVE AND RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE: THE CHURCH
AND STATE CONFLICT RESOLUTION APPROACH ACCORDING TO
1 CORINTHIANS 6:1-11 WITH APPLICATION TO THE RWANDAN CASE

GODFREY GATETE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

PAC UNIVERSITY

20th/11/2021

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my original work and has never been presented to any other University, in part or in its entirety, for an award.



Signature:

Date: 20th/11/2021

Godfrey GATETE (MBTH/10713/0/18)

This Thesis has been submitted for the examination with the approval of the following Supervisors:



_____ Date _____ 20th/11/2021 _____

George Mutuku (PhD), School of Theology, Pan-Africa Christian University



_____ Date _____ 20th/11/2021...

Joshua Rutere (PhD), School of Theology, Pan-Africa Christian University

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated, firstly, to my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for His faithfulness endures forever. He is the rock of my salvation, who called me to salvation both to worship and serve in the field of preaching and teaching His Gospel to the church. He has also contributed to my Academic achievement. May His name be glorified and honoured forever.

I also dedicate this work to my family: to my dear wife, Jeanne Uwera, who supports me in many things. My dear daughters the Gatetes – Shalom, Sharon, Shammah, Shebah and Shekhinah, who have greatly been used by God to make me become a true loving godly father and a hard-working student. You are all my heroines! To my mother-in-law, my all-time chief intercessor, who has consistently and fervently prayed for me. May the Lord reward you abundantly. Lastly, to the greatest of all, is my mother, through whom my academic dream journey started back in 1985 when I was 12 years old, for showing me the way and encouraging me to never give up. Thank you so much mama for your love and prayers.

This thesis is also dedicated to my second family, the Revival Temple Church, Kigali: the inner circle, the wider leadership team, and the entire congregation. Thank you very much for every support and for allowing me to leave Rwanda and pursue my studies in another country for two years. May God Almighty bless you all.

Finally, I dedicate this work to my Kenyan friends: Pastor Susan and Dr Mwangi, serving with Jubilee Evangelistic Ministries, Ruiru church, who gave me the moral and spiritual support when I needed it most; Bishop George Kairu and his family, who provided spiritual and financial support to care for my welfare; Reverend Samuel Maingi and family, who provided friendly fellowship. May the Lord remember your good work; Pastor Samuel Mwaura and family, Pastor Eunice and Sam Mueti and his family, and all of you, I have not mentioned here, and yet made my two years' stay in Nairobi a great joy, thank you very much. May God richly bless and reward you all.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I thank the Almighty God for enabling me to reach this far in the pursuit of my academic dream. He has sustained and renewed my strength even when the journey was very long, tiring, breath-taking and threatening. He has enabled me to achieve my dream to this end. I give Him all the glory, honour, and praise!

Secondly, I also wish to express my sincere appreciation and acknowledgement to all those who made this study possible. I thank my first supervisor, George Mutuku (PhD), my Hebrew lecturer, who has also provided guidance and deep insights especially in converting me to become a biblical scholar. Your input has been invaluable to the success of this work. I am also grateful to my second supervisor, Joshua Rutere (PhD), my lecturer and Head of Department, who has led me in the formation of my Biblical and Theological worldview and tirelessly guided me. Thank you very much and may the Lord you serve so diligently greatly reward you.

Thirdly, I wish to thank people who have walked closely with me on this journey. Thank you Professor Elizabeth Wairimu Mburu, my Greek professor and Kamande Thuo (PhD), my Hebrew lecturer and thesis writing adviser. You have made me fall in love with God's word in the original languages in which it was written and nurtured me into a biblical Scholar. Thank you Anzuruni Barnabe (PhD), my very senior and friendly academic advisor. Reverend Benjamin Nkusi, my thesis proof-reader. Thank you all for your guidance and support, in building me up for the next level of biblical and theological scholarship.

Fourthly, I am eternally grateful to Dr Paul Dupenthaler, Dr Charles Mugisha, and all those who have contributed financially to meet my study cost of Master of Arts degree in Biblical Theology. Thank you all for making this dream a possibility. May God richly reward and increase you even in your financial endeavours.

Lastly, I wish to thank my fellow students in Biblical Theology class, specifically Anthony Njeru (Kenya), John Unekwu Judah (Nigeria), Caleb Ssempijja

(Uganda), Jacob Kipchillis (Kenya), Samson Nguta (Kenya), and all those we have walked together in Hebrew, Greek, and other theological classes. Thank you for making my learning lively and practical.

ABSTRACT

This thesis is about a biblical restorative and retributive justice with reference to the church and state conflict resolution approach, according to 1 Corinthians 6:1-11. It seeks to identify biblical principles in 1 Corinthians 6: 1 – 11 that define the restorative and retributive justice approach to address conflicts and divisions within the church and the community. The study has two objectives, namely, to conduct an exegetical deductive study of 1 Corinthians 6: 1-11 and to set biblical guidelines that define the complementarity of the restorative justice with the retributive justice. In this thesis, the researcher argues that Paul's model of church conflict resolution, as found in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11, is appropriate for adopting the complementarity of the state retributive judicial justice system with the restorative justice approach. The study deductively analyses the text of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 to suggest judiciary principles that can address the conflicts destroying the spiritual and social life of both the church and state. This uniquely offers a biblical retributive and restorative "*Gacaca*", justice informed by biblical principles from the deductive exegetical analysis of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11. The study employs historical grammatical criticism method with some aspects from Socio-scientific criticism to understand the original message of the text in its ancient Jewish, Greco-Roman world context. Based on these methods, the study brings out underlying biblical principles used to resolve conflicts and divisions within the church and state. Accordingly, the study makes three recommendations, namely (1) conflict between two believers should be handled by the wise church members; (2) the concept of conflict resolution and management model and provision of retributive and restorative justice according to 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 is applicable and should be adopted to the church and state justice system; and (3) the church should intentionally disciple members to maturity from whom wise believers are identified and appointed to serve. These wise believers serve to administer equitable retributive and restorative justice to church members, based on biblical principles as derived from 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11. This leads to the "*Biblical Gacaca*", a judiciary system that embodies the retributive and restorative justice in the church and state.

Table of Contents

DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS	x
CHAPTER ONE	1
Introduction.....	1
Background of the study	3
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Aim and Objectives of the study.....	5
Research questions.....	6
Significance of the study.....	6
The scriptural scope of the study	6
Methodological Scope	7
Thematic scope	8
Overview of Methodology Used.....	8
Historical Grammatical Criticism of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11.....	8
Summary	10
CHAPTER TWO	12
LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Introduction.....	12
The Church and Conflict.....	12
Merging and usage of Restorative and Retributive Justice.....	24
CHAPTER THREE	37
THE BACKGROUND STUDY OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT OF 1 CORINTHIANS 6:1-11	37
Explaining the meaning of the guiding Text of 1Corinthians 6:1-11	37
Paul’s Address of the Restorative and Retributive Justice in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11	38
Historical Context of the Epistle of First Corinthians.....	40
<i>Authorship, date, and place of writing</i>	42
<i>Occasion, purpose, and audience</i>	43
<i>Literary Context of First Corinthians</i>	44
<i>Genre of First Corinthians</i>	44
<i>The near context of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11</i>	45
<i>Wider context of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11</i>	47
<i>Biblical Justice through the Ancient Jewish eyes</i>	49
<i>Justice through the modern Jewish eyes</i>	50

<i>Justice through the Greek's eyes</i>	51
Summary	52
CHAPTER FOUR.....	54
EXEGETICAL ANALYSIS OF 1 CORINTHIANS 6:1-11	54
Introduction.....	54
The Inter-textual context of justice within 1 Corinthians 6:1-11: Paul's argument for the need of retributive and restorative justice within the church to administer equitable justice over her trivial cases.	55
Intra-textual Evidence in the Justice System of the Greco-Roman world.....	65
Summary	66
CHAPTER FIVE:	68
SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	68
Introduction.....	68
Summary of the Findings and Recommendations	68
Summary	71
Suggestions for further studies.....	72
Conclusion	72
References.....	74

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AI	: Amnesty International
ICTR	: International Criminal Tribunal Court of Rwanda
IG	: Inkiko Gacaca
PRI	: Penal Review International
RGB	: Rwanda Governance Board
RGC	: Rwanda <i>Gacaca</i> Courts
RoR	: Republic of Rwanda
RPA	: Rwanda Patriotic Army
RPCC	: Rwanda Pentecostal and Charismatic Churches
RPF	: Rwanda Patriotic Front
Rs. J	: Restorative Justice
Rt. J	: Retributive Justice
SBC	: Southern Baptist Convention

DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Rwanda Pentecostal and Charismatic Churches (RPCC): This is a group of existing church and para-church forums which lists Forum for Born Again Churches, Alliance Evangelical Churches, National Unity Fellowship of Pentecostal churches, Rwanda Protestant Council and Sell et Lumiere (Salt and Light).

Rwanda Gacaca Courts (RGC): This is the traditional judiciary system which has been commonly used in Rwanda to resolve both family and community conflicts. The concept stems from the word ‘*gacaca*’ meaning grassroots. As such, the name *Gacaca* is derived from the word ‘*umucaca*’, the Kinyarwanda word referring to soft grass where people sat while settling the community and family conflicts. *Gacaca courts*, therefore mean “justice on the grass”, settled amicably for both retribution and restoration.

Rwanda Governance Board (RGB): This is a state agency set in place by the law N°56/2016 of 16/12/2016 to monitor public and private service delivery, conduct research and promote home-grown solutions on such matters as national governance-decentralization and capacity development policies, to mention but a few.

Conflict: Is defined as “an active disagreement between people with opposing opinions or principles.” (Oxford English Dictionary, 2019, 10). In this thesis, these disagreements concern the church and community members.

Justice: This refers to the system of laws that gives a framework for judging and punishing people in the society (both church and state). In this thesis, justice is looked at in the context of I Corinthians 6: 1-11; the reference being the Bible (Biblical Justice).

Retributive justice: This is a system of criminal justice based on the punishment of offenders rather than on rehabilitation. In this thesis, it is used in reference to other restorative justice paradigms.

Restorative Justice: This is a system of criminal justice which focuses on the rehabilitation of the offenders through reconciliation with victims and the community at large. In this thesis, it is used in contrast to retributive justice as practised in the state and in reference to 1 Corinthians 6 in terms of biblical justice.

Exegetical analysis: This is defined as a critical explanation of a text. In this study, it is an in-depth study of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 to draw principles that bring out biblical restorative and retributive justice approach to resolve conflicts in the church and state.

Church: This comes from Greek compound word *ἐκκλησία* with the preposition *ἐκ* and a derivative root of *καλέω* to mean *a calling out*, a *religious congregation*, an *assembly*, the whole body of Christian believers or *church* (Strong, 2019).

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This thesis discusses a biblical restorative and retributive justice in the context of the church and state conflict resolution with principles drawn from an exegetical analysis of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11. The argument in this thesis is that Paul's model of church conflict resolution, as found in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11, is appropriate for proving both retributive and restorative justice. This is because the model is both restorative and retributive and can provide conflict resolution principles for the contemporary church and state, which constitutes the thesis statement of this work. The study analyses the text of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 to suggest judiciary principles used to address the inter and intra conflicts destroying the spiritual and social life of both the "*Gacaca*" (Costello, 2016) justice informed by biblical principles drawn from the deductive exegetical analysis of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11.

It has been observed that the church as one of the most powerful institutions in many parts of the world has been majorly hampered, weakened, and brought to a great downfall, by the unresolved destructive conflicts, which are either internal or external in nature (Denny & Walter, 2014).

The unresolved internal conflicts are mainly based on social issues, misunderstandings, or misconceptions and are very destructive in nature if not well resolved (Khamadi, 2018). The research studies 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 to highlight the unique biblical principles that underline the restorative and retributive *Gacaca* which guide the church and the state in conflict resolution.

The researcher argues from a biblical perspective to show that Paul's opposition to believers from taking each other to secular courts of law in the 1 Corinthians, does

not invalidate the state retribution judicial system, especially in administering criminal justice. It rather supports the complementarity between retributive and restorative justice by providing biblically sound principles to the church and the state's destructive conflicts. State retributive justice is also supported in Pauline corpus as found in Romans chapter 13 where, on the one hand, the state is ordained by God to administer justice to its nationals, although the state bends more towards retributive than restorative justice, whereas God has ordained both. On the other hand, Paul in Romans chapter 12, warned the believers not to conform to the patterns of this world. This is a reference to the secular judges referred to as "unrighteous judges" in 1 Corinthians 6:1, 6, meaning that the Christians will judge the world and, therefore, should not subject themselves to secular judges they will judge. Instead, the church should find wise and competent spiritual judges, well informed in biblical *Gacaca* principles to resolve conflicts.

This introductory chapter discusses the background to the study. This includes the definition of the church and church conflict, the general biblical (Old and New Testament) perspectives of restorative and retributive justice as well as an overview of empirical research studies. The chapter also includes the problem statement that shows that Paul's model of church conflict resolution, as found in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11, is not contrary to the state retributive justice system, but rather appropriately complements it. Finally, this chapter provides the objectives of the study, the research questions, significance and scope of the study, overview of methodological approach as well as the content of the thesis and conclusion.

Background of the study

The church can be said to have the most appropriate ways to address, resolve conflicts and reconcile the conflicting members using biblical principles without going to secular courts. Secular justice for the believer against another believer provides almost no justice. It rather escalates further conflicts, divisions and splits, and the church members continue to live their lives miserably and shamefully, as Brené Brown describes in his theory of Shame Resilience (Brown, 2020). The shame resilience theory is based on building resilience to shame by connecting with our authentic selves and growing meaningful relationship with other people. Such relations are built on four elements, namely recognizing shame, practising critical awareness, reaching out and storytelling as well as speaking out shame (Barbra, 2020). The Biblical perspective on justice and conflict gives both the definition and the proof of its existence in the social world of the Bible as well as ways to resolve it. Out of this perspective comes biblical principles which were paramount in administering justice and resolving conflict issues of the people, in all aspects of religious and non-religious life (Allen, 2017). These principles are still paramount in our generation. The Bible provides enough wisdom on how believers and non-believers alike can make peace with one another (manage and resolve conflicts). Even so, many believers end up taking most of their litigious disputes to secular courts to decide their doom, instead of seeking justice from wise believers amongst them (Sande, 1996)

The New Testament shows that conflicts took place whenever people were gathered, hence the need for justice. In the gospel of John, before Jesus left this earth, he prayed for the church's unity. The unity of His disciples was to be like one with Himself and the Father. This unity of the disciples was to draw the world to believe Him (John 17:20-21). In the book of Acts, when the early church was undergoing a

change that made conflicts to arise and apostles were called to help resolve that conflict centred around the care for widows (Acts 6: 1 – 4). Again, the book of Acts 15: 36- 41 provides another instance for conflict that revolves around the differing of opinions which finally divide the church's team efforts. Apostle Paul brought out the same idea in Romans 14 and 15 when such issues of food as what should be eaten and that which should be avoided, days that are sacred and those that are not, and issues to do with interpersonal relationships between believers. Furthermore, Apostle James in his letter noted; "But the wisdom that comes from heaven is first pure, then peace-loving, considerate, gentle, full of mercy, and good fruit, impartial and sincere. But the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace" (James 3:17-18). In the context of the First Corinthians, the conflicts are seen as stemming from spiritual immaturity of the believers in the church. Paul speaks of dealing with those immature believers who were still infants in the faith; there were divisions in the Church at Corinth (1 Corinthians 1: 10 – 13; 3: 1- 3).

Arguably, conflicts existed in the New Testament times, and they are inevitable in our times as well. Conflicts in every society (church and non-church alike) destroy human unity from internal fibres to a great downfall.

Therefore, this was the case in Rwanda in the 1994 genocide against the Tutsis which claimed over one million (1,000,000) Tutsis and moderate Hutus innocently (Bizimana, 2017). Due to a great need of justice which was needed after genocide, and formal tribunal courts were already experiencing an over-whelming of genocide cases to be tried for justice, the country came up with a home baked justice system to resolve the genocide cases, to provide justice to both genocide victims and perpetrators. This came to be known as *Gacaca* court system (Amnesty, 2002))

Gacaca literally meaning “lawn” is a Rwandan traditional conflict resolution system for neighbourhood disputes. This name was given to new peoples’ courts with ruling on genocide cases. This justice period ran from 2001 to 2010 (PRI, 2007)

Equitable justice: A “justice according to natural law or right specifically: freedom from bias or favouritism”. This is the justice that is achieved when both restorative and retributive are put together and, in this thesis, they are achieved when guided by the biblical principles.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the existence of conflict resolution committees within the churches in Rwanda, as defined in the law no. N° 72/2018 of 31/08/2018 of Rwanda Governance Board (RGB), the church has continued to be hampered by unresolved conflicts (Matt, 2017). This is because the Church in Rwanda has no biblical guidelines that merge the complementarity between restorative and retributive justice to resolve conflicts as those that are drawn in the study of 1 Corinthians 6: 1 – 11. This study examines how Paul addresses the concept of conflict and how to attain equitable justice in the Corinthian Church. At the same time, it examines biblical principles drawn from 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 which help in bringing out restorative and retributive justice principles to the church and state conflict resolution and management for equitable justice.

Aim and Objectives of the study

This research seeks to identify biblical principles in 1 Corinthians 6:1 – 11 that define the restorative and retributive justice principles, to address conflicts and divisions amongst the believers. The study is guided by two objectives: to conduct a deductive exegetical study of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 drawing on biblical principles Paul used to contextualize the concept of justice and conflict resolution in the Corinthian Church; and, to set guidelines that define the complementarity of the restorative and

retributive justice in preventing, managing, and resolving conflicts within the church and the state.

Research questions

To adequately address the objectives stated above, this study endeavours to answer the following research questions: 1. What biblical principles can be drawn from 1 Corinthians 6: 1-11 that Paul used for the concept of justice and conflict resolution, defining the complementarity of restorative and retributive justice? 2. How can the biblical principles in (1) be used in bridging the existing gap in literature, and resolve conflicts within today's Rwandan church and state?

Significance of the study

This research is significant in that it provides principles drawn from 1 Corinthians 6: 1 -11 to the Rwandan church and state, as well as the global church to control, manage and resolve social conflicts with equitable justice using biblical principles. These principles constitute guidelines by which restorative justice and the state's retributive justice are built together to attain balanced equitable justice. In this way, the Church and the state will have a useable biblical justice approach to prevent, control, manage and resolve existing and future conflicts. These principles also give recommendations to the Rwanda Governance Board (RGB) to reduce the intensifying levels of conflicts in the Rwandan church and state. The said principles will be of great use to academia and institutions that deal with conflict mechanisms in that, they will inform them of the new perspective in dealing with conflicts restoratively and retributively.

The scriptural scope of the study

The pericope of this research is 1 Corinthians 6:1-11. It provides the scriptural scope to be covered in this research; the researcher has chosen it because it addresses a

problem of interest to the study on biblical restorative and retributive justice in the context of the church conflictual issues. The text of 1 Corinthians 6 is a portion of a larger text unit beginning from 1 Corinthians chapter one through chapter eight in which Paul sets instructions directed to members of the congregation at Corinth to control, manage and resolve conflicts among themselves.

Methodological Scope

This research is a deductive exegetical analysis of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11. The exegesis of this text is done against a backdrop of its social, historical, and cultural context using the method of historical grammatical criticism, with some aspects drawn from socio-scientific criticism method. With these historical grammatical criticism and socio-scientific criticism methods, the researcher determines the underlying occasion the author was addressing and analyses any historical and cultural allusions in 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11. He investigates the actual words in the passage, their meaning, and relationships between them. Any significant grammatical features in the passage are examined (Smith, 2008).

The research is done using the New Testament Biblical Greek, to understand the literally meaning of the text from the original author to the original audience, so that all time principles from the first century epistle will be drawn out for usage in the twenty first century church and state. Thus, this research seeks to know how the concept of justice and conflict was conceptualized in the Corinthian Church as addressed by Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11. With that, it seeks to come up with the biblical principles for preventing, managing, and resolving conflicts in the church and state restoratively and retributively. The extent of this research is biblical deductive exegetical research using library resources

Thematic scope

This research examines the justice and conflict resolution and management approach by Apostle Paul in the Corinthian church. The study analyses the complementarity of restorative and retributive justice to the conflicts based on the principles drawn from 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 and to a wider context of Romans 13. In this way, the theme of this study is biblical restorative and retributive justice approach with the understanding that Apostle Paul uses both to address conflicts within the church and state.

Overview of Methodology Used

Methodologically, the nature of this study required document analysis without fieldwork. This is a descriptive qualitative library research which employs a deductive exegetical analysis of 1 Corinthians 6: 1-11 to build biblical principles that embrace restorative and retributive justice and address conflicts and divisions within the church and the community in general. The exegetical analysis is accomplished using historical grammatical criticism with some aspects from socio-scientific criticism methods, which help in determining the meaning of the biblical text in its historical and literary contexts (Zuck, 1996)

Historical Grammatical Criticism of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11

The historical grammatical criticism is necessary if one is going to interpret the Bible rightly. Such criticism helps the interpreter to be sensitive while determining the meaning of the biblical text in its historical and literary contexts under examination. This also means that the interpreter must be sensitive to the text's grammar or literary form (word usage). This is the obvious meaning or obvious sense the original listeners or readers understood. This does not mean that literal interpretation does not recognize nuances, metaphors, similes, hyperbole, and symbolism, lays on words, or various

figures of speech which the biblical writer may have used in the text. On the contrary, Historical Grammatical Method is at a greater advantage of interpretation because it can be used in interpreting any literature (ancient or modern, sacred, or secular). This is, however, not the case with postmodern approach, which does not seek authorial intent, but just gives the meaning to the text by itself. The historical-grammatical method controls the exegete from falling prey to common abuses of Scripture through misinterpretation (Kieran, 2017)

Similarly, Hayes and Holladay (2007) further explain that this criticism involves exploring the history of the text which includes: the situation out of which the text arose, authorship, audience, setting and many others. In the continued advancement of thought, Hayes and Holladay perceive that the thought form of the author delineated from the analysis of the text in the original [Greek language helps to generate and arrive at the author's original worldview. (Hayes and Holladay, 2007).

In reference to 1 Corinthians 6:1-11, Shillington George argues that many believers are sceptical of the judicial system of the state which is the likely attitude of Paul in the statement in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 (Shillington, 1986). Paul echoes a scepticism in his reference to state judges as “unrighteous” (*adikon*, v. 1) and “unbelievers” (*apiston*, v. 6). But there is a need to take heed lest one breaks the bounds of the form and intention of the text because Paul does not invalidate state retributive judicial system as one may tend to resolve. Instead, Paul advocates for both retributive and restorative forms of justice.

Here, several questions come to surface: What was the specific case to be tried before the secular judges? How does this text (6:1-11) fit with the preceding chapter about sexual immorality (5:1-13)? How does it connect with the subsequent passage of (6:12-23) also dealing with sexual problems? Do verses 9-11 with their catalogue of

vices belong with the argument against taking a brother to court? Why is the tone of address so sharp? Arguably, this statement from Paul can be understood from several angles, namely the form address, the conviction underlying the argument, the identity of the case (*pragma*), the root problem at Corinth, and Paul's concessive or radical solution to the problem (Shillington, 1986).

The socio-scientific criticism in the interpretive application of 1 Corinthians 6:

1-11

Since the application is on the Rwandan Context building on the Corinthian Context, the researcher used the African hermeneutical approach as Mburu beautifully described it as four –legged stool, “which in this case are (a) parallels to the African context, (b) the theological context, (c) the literary context, (d) the historical context. These legs support the seat, which represents the final stage of interpretation – the application (Mburu, 2019).” From the Corinthian context, the research applied the text of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 to the Rwanda Gacaca experience as the government of Rwanda tried to bring equitable justice, both restorative and retributive to all Rwandans after the Rwandan 1994 genocide.

Summary

This thesis discusses a biblical restorative and retributive justice in the context of the church and state conflict resolution with principles drawn from an exegetical analysis of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11. The argument in this thesis is that Paul's model of church conflict resolution, as found in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11, is appropriate for proving both retributive and restorative justice for the contemporary church and state. The church can be said to have the most appropriate ways to address, resolve conflicts and reconcile the conflicting members using biblical principles without going to secular

courts. This kind of bible-based justice restores the believers' harmony within the church, and does not escalate further conflicts, divisions, and splits.

These conflictual issues emanate from the commonly offered state retributive justice, with little or no restoration, making church members continue to live their lives miserably and shamefully, as Brené Brown describes in his theory of Shame Resilience (Brown, 2020). Despite the existence of conflict resolution committees within the churches in Rwanda, the church has continued to be hampered by increase of unresolved conflicts (Matt, 2017). This is because the Church in Rwanda has no biblical guidelines that merge the complementarity between restorative and retributive justice to resolve the church and state conflicts as those that are drawn in the study of 1 Corinthians 6: 1 – 11.

The study is guided by two objectives: to conduct a deductive exegetical study of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 setting guidelines that define the complementarity of the restorative and retributive justice in preventing, managing, and resolving conflicts within the church and the state. The exegetical analysis is accomplished using historical grammatical criticism which helps in determining the meaning of the biblical text in its historical and literary contexts with some mentions from socio-scientific criticism, bringing out socio-cultural issues behind the text (Zuck, 1996).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review seeks to show the gap in the existing literature and how this gap, according to Paul's approach on justice and conflict resolution in 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11, demonstrates deficiency in the church conflict management and state judiciary system.

The Church and Conflict

The word *church* comes from Greek compound word *ἐκκλησία* with the preposition *ἐκ* and a derivative root of *καλέω* to mean *a calling out*, a *religious congregation*, an *assembly*, the whole body of Christian believers or *church* (Strong, 2019). Paul's use of this word in dative case was to mean that people are called out into the church as the indirect object dative; they are the recipients of the calling, to be changed or transformed into saints (*ἀγίων*). Since this occurs as a gradual process, and people take undetermined period to measure up the fully effected transformation, it can then be argued that where there are people, there will always be conflicting situation. Most church conflicts emerge from low or zero transformations in the lives of the believers.

Conflict has been defined as a “serious disagreement or argument, typically a protracted one or a serious incompatibility between two or more opinions, principles, or interests (Hornby, 1995).” In the Corinthian church, the fact that members of the church were from diverse backgrounds (Greeks, Jews, poor and rich, slaves and free), with different opinions and views about life, different cultural values, principles, and interests, they were continually disagreeing and were incompatible by nature in many

ways (Campbell, 2017). Without doubt, therefore, there were conflicts within the Corinthian church, much as they were in the city of Corinth.

There are varieties of understanding of the term conflict. Hugh F. Halverstadt defines conflict as, power struggles over differences. Differing information, beliefs, interests, desires, values, or abilities to secure needed resources are part of what constitutes conflict (Halverstadt, 1991). Conflict is the air of dissonance (in verbal skills and actions) between dissimilar ideas and desires existing in all human spectrums (Halverstadt, 1991). In this regard, Hart Brett argues that Conflict administration depends on getting persons the right to be heard of their real concerns and to act logically (Hart, 2019).

All the scholars above have written about conflicts in the church, how they have negatively affected the church congregation members and their leaders, how these conflicts have affected the growth and health of the church. Overall, however, none of them has written on principles of “biblical *Gacaca*” from Paul’s point of view in 1 Corinthians 6: 1 -11, that puts together the restorative and retributive justice as guideline principles to help the church overcome their conflicting situations, to be a model of equitable justice delivery.

In the Old Testament, God spoke to the Israelites through Moses saying; “Do not take revenge or bear a grudge against anyone among your people but love your neighbour as yourself. I am the Lord” (Leviticus 19:18). The expressions “Do not take revenge” and “love your neighbour” are simultaneous to each other. James Kugel suggests that the expressions neighbour, brother, nations, and fellow all refer to people who belong to the similar faction and that the sense of ‘love your neighbor’ in verse 18 could be understood as requiring them to hate the people outside the group. An ending clause is used, “I am the Lord” to establish the source of the authority of the command

“not to revenge” and “to love” one another as people of the same family or faction as from the Lord (Kugel, 1999). As it were, unresolved conflicts brood revenge even amongst the people of God. Only peace-making biblical principles can resolve the church’s conflicts of all kinds in the most suitable way possible for the appropriate justice.

Fuller Leanna comments on intensive conflicts as destroying all human life, in conventional, intermingled, and modern-day communities worldwide and finds out that it utterly ruins the church’s labours on evangelism and achievement of the Great Commission (Fuller, 2016). Similarly, Blosch and Hicks both agree that conflict destroys church members, pastors, and their families, and all their long-term relationships are destroyed overnight (Blosch, 2006) and (Hicks, 2010).

Furthermore, the church should be trained on how to love, protect, and convict the congregation members to do the work of the Lord in conflict free state and to maintain the church’s reputation to achieve her mission as advanced by Weem (Weem, 2013). When church conflicts are on the increase and are not properly resolved, as they advance, they increase the behavioural threats among the congregation members and leaders and could lead to religious violence (Klocek and Henne, 2019)

Defining Justice

Justice can be defined in various ways according to the diverse contexts and concepts in which it is to be addressed. According to Oxford Advanced Learners’ Dictionary, Justice is defined as “the fair treatment of people or the legal system used to punish people who have committed crimes” (Hornby, 1995). *Justice* is exercised in four major categories worldwide: *Distributive justice* – also known as economic justice which ensures that every individual has access to the resources (Gandhi, 2016). *Procedural Justice* – is one which concerns taking of the decisions and their

implementation and to ensure that all individuals receive the treatment they deserve, after negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and adjudication are done (Ololube, 2016). *Restorative Justice* – focuses on ensuring that the welfare of the victim through victim-offender mediation based on written agreement (Muftic, 2015). *Retributive Justice*, here referred to as the state justice, focuses on punishing the transgressor, thus, restoring the intrinsic moral good in the transgressor and not inflicting the disproportionately large punishments on him/her (Alexander, 2013).

Restorative Justice

The Restorative justice definition given by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime is that, “it is a way of reacting to criminal behaviour by consideration of the needs of the community, the victims, and the offenders (Dandurand, 2006). It is an embryonic concept that has propagated into dissimilar elucidation in different countries, one around which there is always not a just right consensus. Howard Zehr gives a definition of Restorative justice as a process to participate, to the extent feasible, individuals who have a chance in a distinct offense and to carefully and collectively identify and address harms and ills, desires, and compulsions, in order that one puts things as right as possible (Howard, 2002)

Furthermore, Marshall Tony Francis of the United Kingdom Restorative Commission describes Restorative justice as a process in which all the faction with a gamble in a scrupulous offence, come together to resolve collectively, how to deal with the consequences of the offense and its consequences for their future (Marshall, 1995) A variety of terminologies are often used to express the restorative justice movement. These include communitarian justice, making amends, positive justice, relational justice, reparative justice, community justice and restorative justice, among others (Dandurand, 2006).

It is worth noting that the restorative justice movement began as an effort to rethink the needs which crimes create together with the roles contained in crimes. Restorative justice promotes the needs that were not being met in the usual justice process with the belief that the prevailing understanding of legitimate participants or stakeholders in justice was too restrictive. It is a process that involves to the extent possible, those who have a stake in a specific offense and to collectively identify and address harms, needs and obligations, to heal and put things as right as possible. This is done with the aim of putting key decisions into the hands of those most affected by the crime, thus, making justice more healing and, ideally, more transformative to reduce the likelihood of the cycle of future offenses (Howard, 2002)

According to Howard Zehr and Harry Mika (1998), there are three fundamental principles. Firstly, crime is fundamentally a violation of people and interpersonal relationships. That is to say that the victims and the community have been harmed and need restoration. Secondly, the victims, offenders and the affected community are the key stakeholders in justice. Thirdly, violation creates obligations and liabilities, meaning that the offender's obligations are to make things right as much as possible and the community's obligations are to both the victims and the offenders as well as to the general welfare of its members.

Furthermore, Zehr and Harry (1998) contends that restorative justice pursues to cure and to correct the wrongs, that is, the wishes of fatalities for information, validation, vindication, restitution, testimony, safety, and support are the beginning stages of justice of the peace. In addition, the process of restorative justice maximizes occasions for exchange of information, involvement, negotiation, and shared agreement amongst fatality and delinquent, reprobates' desires and capabilities are delivered. The justice process belongs to the community, and in restorative justice, the justice is

mindful of the outcomes, intended and unintended, of its responses to crime and victimization (Zehr & Harry, 1998).

The three principles, on the one hand, allude to the fact that restorative justice focuses on harm, that means that restorative justice understands the crime, first, as a harm done to people and communities. On the other hand, state legal systems focus on rules and laws, and emphasize less being concerned primarily with making sure offenders get what they deserve and the victims being a secondary concern of justice.

In these principles, it is also the case that wrongs, or harms result in obligation for restorative justice to emphasize offender accountability and responsibility. That is to say that when on one side of the state legal system, accountability makes sure offenders are punished, on the other side, restorative justice emphasizes the fact that, accountability means offenders are to be encouraged to understand the harm they caused. As such, they must begin to realize the effects of their behaviour and their responsibility to make things right, as much as possible both concretely and symbolically.

The third principle, therefore, implies that restorative justice promotes engagement or participation of the victims, offenders, members of the community in that the restorative justice addresses the harms and related needs (of victims, of the community and of the offenders). This holds offenders accountable to put right those harms, resulting in obligations on the part of the offenders and the communities and in the process of the three – victims, offenders and communities are engaged (Howard, 2002)

The restorative justice results in victims being involved in the judiciary process come out satisfied. The offenders understand how their offenses have affected other people and take responsibility for those actions, while the outcomes help to repair the

harms done and address the reasons for the offence with specific plans being designed to the victims' and the offenders' needs. Finally, victims and offenders both gain a sense of satisfaction, and both are reintegrated into the community (Sharpe, 2018),

Restorative justice is, for the most part, used to explain casual and non-adjudicative figures of dispute resolving such as victim-offender arbitration, family offences and indigenous forms of justice which give victims, offenders and the community power to decision making (Roach, 2000). When all parties are involved, then justice is equitable and complete for all. Although a dichotomy is paramount, disputes in the church should be left to the church to handle them because the church's wise saints are able and competent to take charge of their own conflicts.

Restorative justice proponents dispute that the contemporary system of correction is erected on the glamorized supposition of retributive justice as unfair to the transgressor, ineffective in establishing social safety and harmony, and arduous due to the outflow of public treasure (Gavrielides, 2014)

According to Kent Roach, there are convincing reasons for not establishing programmes of restorative justice to the insertion of retributive justice on both ethical grounds and practical contemplation (Roach, 2000). This research seeks to deal with the principle of combining both models into the justice system of restorative and retributive chastisements following the principles derived from the 1 Corinthians 6: 1-11.

It is suitable to regard these as the practical contemplations for espousing both models to include restoratively just principles to criminal lawbreakers while upholding dedication to retribution. These principles include, but not limited to, ameliorating the austerity of modern correctional practices. Realistically, the utilization of restorative

justice may be effectual when limited to explicit area of conflict and specific levels of lawbreakers, such as infantile.

In opposition to the above, the latest model to reimbursement for immoral offenses, come into view as resolute in which both the victim and offender are keenly involved in deciding the consequences of the offense. Mark Umbrett advances the argument that beneath this model, the state now turns out to be the inactive compliant, or at most, an arbitrator making the interaction of victim and offender possible. This is because restorative justice defines crime as a contravention of one human being by another, and not a contravention of the state. Here, dialogue and negotiations are normative; with a focal point upon problem-solving for the future instead of instituting culpability for past behaviour (Umbrett, 1989)

Retributive Justice

Retribution is basically the state imposing the recognized consequences of the alternative made by the lawbreaker when he or she broke the law or canon (Westacot, 2019). The power of administering castigation is the power of the sovereign as the highest supremacy to impose pain upon the offender on account of a misdemeanour committed by him or her. Appreciation of retribution as the justification or the elemental facet of penalty raises the query of the place of the momentous facets of criminal chastisement including prevention (extraordinary prevention of the offender and universal prevention of the community members), rehabilitation, and remoteness for the reason of dangerousness (Greenwalt, 2002)

Contrary to the restorative justice, retributive justice has been allied to the institution of criminal chastisement or penalty. Retribution engrosses the imposition of a suitable sanction or punishment for infringement of the punitive law. Retributionists classically support that the *lex talionis*, that is, retaliation as a penalty method for

deciding the extent to which the wrongdoer or offender must undergo somewhat like what his victim underwent (Jeffrie *et al.* 1998).

Retribution should, however, not be frequently erroneously understood as seeking retaliation or retribution by inflicting or imposing affliction upon an offender. Instead, retribution should be unwritten as the justification for criminal penalty. Retributive Justice fundamentally demotes to the mend of justice throughout the imposition of penalty. Retribution satisfies the state justice and the penal law but does not satisfy the three main important people involved, the offender, the victim, and the community. Squaring the application of both restorative and retributive types of justice in both church and state provides complete and equitable justice.

It follows that to understand this subject of justice in the context of the church and state, there is a need to know about the dynamics of these two forms of justice. One kind of justice does not provide equitable justice to the offender or the victim. For a very long time in history, punitive justice is the most important justification with prominence on the magnitude of deficiency as a momentous gauge of the suitable penalty (Daly, 2002). This model of justice results in comprehensive sentences for many lawbreakers, and intensification in the populace of incarcerated individuals, piling up in prison cells, jails, and detainments.

This results in abusing a lot of public funds on feeding the prisoners and taking care of their general welfare, not forgetting the management and administration costs of these prisons (Hermann, 2017). Consequently, the government punishes the innocent members of the public indirectly or directly by imposing heavy taxes on them, to meet these prison cost demands.

In the same line of argument, Tyler (2006) maintains that the fundamental squabble is that felonious justice system that is bottomed on the method of retribution

as a centre for reprimand, for the most part frequently inflicted through incarceration, has proven unsuccessful. This is because in the retaliatory world, an approach in which the principal way of encouraging compliance with the law is through the appliance of sanction.

Hart (2019) further expounds this concept by discussing that the state (country) through hearing or prosecution before a judge or umpire, must institute the guilt of a person for contravention of the law. After the deciding of guilt, a judge or umpire imposes the suitable or fitting verdict, which can consist of a fine, internment, or in extreme cases, a death sentence. In conventional notion and language, the ideas of misdemeanour and chastisement have been indissoluble. As such, the consequences of conviction for crime have been portrayed as a substance of castigation obviously (Jeffrey, 2021). This kind of justice has less to do with victim – offender reparation; rather it satisfies state justice and her penal law, which eventually broods incomplete justice to the community. The members of the church should receive restorative justice over accorded with retribution of some kind, and the state should offer retribution coupled with restoration equally as much.

Moral responsibility in this situation entails more than compensation, which speaks to the substance element of the offense or crime. It also necessitates compensation, which is connected to the moral responsibility of the wrongdoer (Redford, 2015). In the modern-day state, every immoral act done by the wrongdoer, even though it engrosses mischief or harm to a person or entity such as imposition of bodily injury or dispossession of asset or property, is translated into a social impairment, which is now denominated as a misdemeanour or crime. The misdemeanour is now seen as an infringement of a law, which offers an established

sentence for the law infringement. This sentence is the plausible corollary of the law contravention.

In short, whereas it may be squabbling that retribution is essential to reinstate justice, or that retributive justice is essential to sustain both the legal and moral order, it does not speak-out the penalties of crime to the victim harmed, and offender's dilapidation adequately. This, therefore, calls for restorative justice to be applied in all judicial systems (state and individual cases), for the purposes of involving all parties, the offender, the victim, and the community, for a complete metamorphosis of justice. This spells the need for Paul approach in 1 Corinthians 6: 1-11 to see restorative and retributive justice as working together to bring to normal the conflictual parties.

Biblical View of Restorative and Retributive Justice

All along, the Bible has been a source of inspiration in constructing institutions of both the contemporary civil, criminal justice and the early practice of restorative justice to-date. In a world in rebellion against God, full of exploitation and wickedness, a good God must be a God of judgement and not necessarily a wrathful, vengeful God with penal substitution. The idea that God who brings judgement and justice, however, implies that the justice of God is primarily a restorative and then retributive (Gerry, 2011). As it were, in the bible, justice and righteousness are clearly associated with the presence of God as the life bestowing force (Amos 5: 6-7, 14-15).

The Old Testament justice of God is not primarily retributive but salvific. It is also not primarily punitive but corrective, because God created the earth and its inhabitants for harmonious relationships, thus, even in rebellion, he still effects such relationships. Biblical justice has to do with conformity with the will of the loving, covenant – making creator, God. This is suggestive of love expressed in the face of evil

acts to stop evil, and to heal its effects. It speaks of a love that is both redemptive and salvific.

In the New Testament, Jesus asserted that He has come to fulfil the Torah not to repudiate it (Matthew 5:17). He quoted the greatest commandment from the Torah, “you shall love the Lord God with all your being and love your neighbour as yourself.” This summarizes all the law and prophecy (Matthew 22:37-40; (Grimsrud, 2002).

The book of Acts is a typical example when apostles had to intervene to give justice to the widows (Acts 6: 1-4), hence the need for justice. In the gospel of John, before Jesus left this earth, he prayed for church’s unity. The unity of Jesus’ disciples was to be like one with himself and the Father. This kind of unity of the disciples was to consequentially draw the world to believe Him (John 17:20-21). In the book of Acts, when the early church was undergoing a change that made conflicts to arise and apostles were called to help resolve that conflict centered around the care for widows (Acts 6: 1 – 4).

Following the context of the First Corinthians is that conflicts from spiritual immaturity of the believers in the church calls for restorative and retributive justice. As it were in the Old and New Testament, today, the church needs wise elders to settle her disputes using biblical principles from God’s word to administer equitable justice for all, as Paul’s instructions to the Corinthian Church.

In a nutshell, Biblical restorative justice, in its complementarity to retributive justice, is a bible-based communitarian-relational-reparative type of justice, which Dandurand does not bring out in his restorative justice works (Dandurand, 2006). Hence the call for Biblical *Gacaca* which is built around the biblical principles derived from 1 Corinthians 6:1-11. This complementarity gives a guarantee to reduce on the austerity of contemporary long-life sentencing, and over hiking budget expenditures incurred on

running and managing prisons in the current system of retributive justice. Such complementarity also provides an approach to justice that will reduce on court cases of churches and other non-faith court cases filling up the courts today.

Merging and usage of Restorative and Retributive Justice

Restorative and retributive justice are not opposite forms of justice as some would assume. They have commonalities right from their primary goal of vindicating through reciprocity and both acknowledging a basic moral intuition. This means that a balance has been thrown off by a wrongdoing and, subsequently, the victim deserves something, and the offender owes something (Hadley, 2001).

Furthermore, both approaches argue that there must be a proportional relationship between the act and the response. Their difference comes on the currency that will fulfil the obligations and strike the balance. On the counterproductive belief of the retributive theory that pain will vindicate, the restorative justice approach argues that what truth vindicates is acknowledgement of victims' harms and needs, combined with an active effort to encourage offenders to take responsibility, make right the wrongs, and address the causes of their wrongdoing. The result is the potential restorative justice offered to affirm both victim and offender and to help the two transform their lives (Zehr, 2017).

Amid attending to the wishes of fatalities, reprobates, and the state effectively, amalgamation of restorative and retributive justice must be applied. This indispensable amalgamation addresses the benefits of all parties to unlawful occasion, counting the victim, the lawbreaker, and the state. Restorative justice deals with the needs of the victim for compensation and reinstatement or restoration. On the one hand, restorative justice speaks for the benefits of the wrongdoer for pardon and reintegration into the community. On the other hand, retributive justice deals with the wants of the state to

preserve the criminal law by enforcing and punishing, restoring the reprobate's moral state as outcome of the imposing and acceptance of approved castigation. Amid antagonistic concerns, there is need for both restorative and retributive justice (Gerry, 2011). Without both models working together, justice is not equitable and balanced!

A division can appear amid restorative justice, and it is facilitating a victim's compensation, and retributive justice, which imposes reprobate's punishment and may look for impending rehabilitation and healing. Nevertheless, restorative justice is unswervingly startled with the delinquent being reinstated to the community and restoration of his or her dignity (Tyler, 2006). Although a dichotomy is paramount, social cases in the church should be left for church judges because the church's wise saints are able and competent to take charge of their own conflict issues. The church should not take any of their conflict issues to the secular court judges to preserve the dignity and the reputation of the gospel of Christ, the clergy, and the church life institution in general.

To understand the proper place for restorative justice in a good way, one needs to understand that it widens the answer to offense from a focal point on the contravention of laws and the consequential chastisement, to a primary focus on the fatality and reprobate. Conversely, it is noteworthy that such amalgamation of restorative and retributive justice also meets the supplementary objectives of recompensing or provision of reparations for the fatality and the possibility of pardon and reintegration of the reprobate into the community. On this note, Villa finds that restorative justice seeks out to recover proportions of justice often missing within the institutional retributive justice process but does not essentially throw out all castigatory measures coupled with the retributive progression. It looks rather to be more comprehensive in the endorsement of justice (Charles, 2006).

As to their usage, the process of retributive justice prohibits straight contribution of the victim and pays no attention to any indispensable compensation or reinstatement of the victim. The plain place for restorative justice in attending to the damage or injury experienced by the victim and the need for clemency and re-socialization of the reprobate in the modern-day response to unlawful conduct is the key in obtaining absolute and inclusive equitable justice for all. Restorative justice functioning unaccompanied is insufficient because there is lack of participation or contribution by the state; nor does restorative justice provide adequate consideration for preservation of the unlawful code of conduct.

There is also no satisfactory consideration for the impairment to the communal order brought by unlawful contravention further than the visible injury or harm to the acknowledged fatalities or the exact impact on the community. As such, contemplation requires to be rendered to such secondary impacts as dreadful instances to others, necessary costs to enlarge fortification from predictable analogous incidents of offence, and the emotional expenses to neighbours who identify with the victim.

Critics to this model debate that there is an inconsistency between the reconciliation objective of restorative justice and the condemnatory objective of retributive punishment (Hermann, 2017). In the same line of argument, McCord Paul reasons that the minutest components of a restorative justice cycle necessitate an advancement in which the fatality and their delinquent assemble face-to-face and come to certain comprehension, which encompasses the outcome that they have settled. The admission of the offense committed and the energetic contribution in the reparation of harm, are supposed to be the squarest ways to healing for all individuals affected by the injury (McCord, 2017).

This section could be summarized, thus, that whereas it may be squabbling that retribution is essential to reinstate justice, or that retributive justice is essential to sustain both the legal and moral order, it does not speak-out the penalties of crime to the victim harmed and the offender's dilapidation adequately. This, therefore, calls for restorative justice to be applied in all judicial systems (state, individual and church justice), for the purposes of involving all parties, for a complete equitable justice metamorphosis.

The *Gacaca* Justice System in Rwanda

There was genocide against Tutsis and moderate Hutus in Rwanda in the 1994 which claimed over one million (1,000,000) innocent lives in just ninety (90) days, (Bizimana, 2017). Due to the greater need of justice after genocide, and formal tribunal courts were already experiencing an over-whelming of genocide cases to be tried for justice, the country came up with a home baked justice system to resolve the genocide cases, to provide justice to both genocide victims and perpetrators, and to foster unity and reconciliation among Rwandans. This came to be known as *Gacaca* court system (Amnesty, 2002).

Gacaca literally meaning "lawn" is a Rwandan traditional conflict resolution system for neighbourhood disputes. This name was given to new peoples' courts with ruling on genocide cases. This justice period ran from 2001 to 2010, (PRI, 2007). Even though many authors have written on restorative and retributive justice, but not many of them have been able to demonstrate biblical principles for both restorative and retributive approaches to justice, and as complementary to each other, using 1 Corinthians 6:1 -11.

The socio-historical formation of the Rwandan *Gacaca* courts

With the overwhelming figures of the death of the genocide victims within a hundred days and the big number of perpetrators, the enormous task of the new government in rebuilding Rwanda was as communal and psychological as it were economic and political. The need for Rwanda to develop an appropriate justice model

fitting the after-genocide context went without saying. The factors that describe the importance of such a justice model are first of all, the existing judicial and social system (before 1994) which was built on the "culture of impunity" that permeated the corrupt governments during and after colonization (Moneyman, 2004). Even so, former Justice actors had died or exiled.

The International Criminal Tribunal of Rwanda (ICTR) defined impunity as the "failure to punish violations of established norms" (Moneyman, 2004). In the essay, "Establishing Collective Norms," researchers contend that the ICTR definition should include that "impunity involves an erosion of standards, so that those who hold social power become less bound by cultural, moral or legal norms that were once nearly universal" (Moneyman, 2004). The concept of impunity is particularly important because when developing a model of reconciliatory justice, the concept of justice within the Rwandan community has to be shifted from the neglect of established norms to accountability and an overall development of right and wrong behaviour. Another factor that led to the development of an internal organic justice system was the failure of the ICTR to adequately try accused perpetrators of the genocide.

In 1994, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 955 authorizing the formation of the ICTR to contribute to the process of peace and reconciliation, rectify violations, and strengthen the Rwandan judicial system (Uvin, 2003). The effectiveness of the ICTR has been arguably minimal if not counterproductive. Some argue that the prime function of the ICTR is to simply "reaffirm the international community's own morality" (Uvin, 2003). The ICTR with an annual budget of USD \$80,000,000, has indicted only 61 suspects and has sentenced only six (Harrell, 2003). It follows then that the great number of genocide suspects and the high cost of maintaining the prison system led to the need for a participatory justice model that includes all members of the

community and builds unity. This need to build unity led the Rwandan government to explore what Uvin calls an "unprecedented legal-social experiment of transforming a traditional community-based conflict resolution mechanism called Gacaca, into a tool for judging people accused of participation in the genocide and the massacres" (Uvin, 2003). In February 2001, the Rwandan government established the formation of the Gacaca Jurisdictions in the Rwandan Organic Law.

The term gacaca refers to the variety of grasses that cover the Rwanda's rolling hills. Prior to Belgian colonization, village elders known as "inyangamugayo" would sit on gacaca to mediate and arbitrate issues with all affected parties present. After mediating the issue and reaching a solution, the wrongdoer would pay reparations and the parties would share a drink (Harrell, 2003). It was indeed retributive and restorative at the same time but lacking some guidelines. Many people living in rural Rwanda are not familiar with Western-based judicial systems, while others think that foreign structures are impractical and adversarial for victims. As a result, a practical and more familiar system was modified and put in place to build "coexistence and reconciliation" and to meet desirable long-term and short-term goals (Moneyman, 2004).

Inkiko-Gacaca was formed with the goal of revealing the truth about what happened during the genocide (Moneyman, 2004). Prior to the instatement of Inkiko-Gacaca few prisoners were willing to admit to crimes, but afterwards over one-third of the prison population have already prepared confessions for their Gacaca trial (Harrell, 2003). The incentive for prisoners confessing is a lighter sentence and/or a faster release. Acknowledging killing, injuring, raping, stealing and inciting others to violence affirms to both the victims and perpetrators that wrongdoing had occurred and that the culture of impunity needs to be addressed. Victims are being given the opportunity to

share the suffering and abuse they endured, as well as participate in the outcome of the justice process.

The contributions of all parties help Rwandans move forward in reconciliation. The implementation of a participatory model that includes victims and their relatives, perpetrators and their relatives, bystanders and returned refugees helps the community address these issues collectively and build relationships. Educating Rwanda's young population about the horrors of genocide and socializing them to engage in peace and reconciliation also helps to eradicate the culture of impunity (Harrell, 2003).

Other goals of Gacaca are to speed up the trials and to readmit the perpetrators into the community to be productive members of society and help build the economy. Finally, Rwanda wants to show the international community that Rwandan society can settle its own problems through a system of justice based on custom (RoR, 2004). The highly structured Inkiko-Gacaca system allows the community to serve as defenders, prosecutors, judge, and jury. Reputable members of the community are elected as the *inyangamugayos* (persons of integrity) or judges to facilitate hearings and render just decisions based on the testimony. The *inyangamugayos* set the tone for Gacaca trials and built confidence in the community for full participation. Given the sparse resources, *inyangamugayos* did gradually receive training on how to conduct hearings, and elections are taking place at every level of the newly formed system.

One of the first tasks of the Inkiko-Gacaca, led by *inyangamugayos*, is the categorization of accused perpetrators. Category one is comprised of the planners, organizers, instigators, supervisors, and leaders of the genocide. This includes any person at any level of government, political party, army, religious institution who committed acts of sexual torture, or violence (RoR, 2004). Approximately 2,133 of these accused *genocidaires* will be tried in conventional courts (RoR, 2004).

The sentences for these offenses are the death penalty or a life sentence. Category two includes those whose acts of criminal participation placed them among the perpetrators, conspirators or accomplices of intentional homicide or serious assault that caused death (RoR, 2004). The sentences for category two are 25 years to life imprisonment. Category three perpetrators are those whose criminal acts or whose acts of criminal participation make them guilty of other serious assaults against a person. The sentence for category three crimes is five to seven years' imprisonment (RoR, 2004). The final category, four, is for those who committed offenses against property. The sentence for these crimes is court-ordered reparation of damages or another settlement reached with the victim (RoR, 2004).

It is to be noted that except for category four, most of these offenses are greatly reduced if a confession is given prior to indictment (Moneyman, 2004). Currently, there are four levels of organization in the Inkiko-Gacaca justice system: Level Village (8,987 courts) Sector (1,531 courts); Court Structure Inkiko-Gacaca: 19 judges and the general assembly which is the entire adult population of the village Inkiko-Gacaca: 19 judges and at least 50 general assembly members elected from village level Functions Compile lists, categorize the accused and try category IV crimes Try category III crimes (RoR, 2004).

At the village level, every person in the community over the age of 18 is expected to participate in the general assembly. The village may have anywhere between 80 to 400 households or 700 to 900 people (RoR, 2004). The main responsibilities of the general assembly at the village level is to compile a list of those who died as a result of the 1994 genocide, those who were raped, and those who committed such crimes. This body also gathers evidence that incriminates or exonerates those who have been accused (RoR, 2004).

Nationally there are 8,987 village courts that have elected 19 inyangamugayos to reside over the hearings of those accused of category four crimes (Moneyman, 2004). Sector level courts try category three crimes. There are 1,531 sector courts where 19 inyangamugayos have been elected for each sector court as well as 50 general assembly members from various villages. The next level of organization is the district jurisdiction where category two crimes are tried along with appeal cases for category three. There are 154 district courts.

All the above-mentioned jurisdictions have an Inkiko-Gacaca structure, whereas the provincial courts that try category one crimes have a conventional judicial system (Moneyman, 2004). *Gacaca* court system in Rwanda did much the same as this in deciding thousands of genocide cases after the 1994 genocide against the Tutsis (O'Reilly Colin et Zhang, 2016). The offenders and victims came together face-to-face in the community-based local courts known as *Gacaca courts* (O'Reilly Colin et Zhang, 2016).

Most offenders acknowledged their genocide crimes, confessed those crimes to the victims on how they murdered their family members, and where they threw the remains of the relatives of the victims. Great forgiveness and reconciliations occurred in the Rwandan Society through *Gacaca courts* arising from the heartily confessions and truth telling. This should be a model for the church to follow to achieve both restorative and retributive justice, but the church and the state still lack guiding biblical principles to build and foster a fully reconciled society of Rwandans, living above genocide wounds, in harmony and as a fully restored community.

The Rwanda *Gacaca courts* approach, used to judge the perpetrators of the 1994 Rwandan genocide against the Tutsis, was an example of this kind of justice. If the *Gacaca courts* resolved the highest crimes of humanity such as “*the genocide cases*,”

why would the now justice' with biblical *Gacaca* founded on the bible, not be able to resolve the social conflicts of the church and the State? This should apply regardless of whether the social conflicts are arising from doctrinal differences, abuse of church or community finances, and biblically unethical Christian behaviours?

Gacaca restorative justice model provided victims a platform to express their feelings and offer an account of the penalty of pain they have undergone because of the offender's conduct or action (Costello, 2016). Victim and offender with the help of the jury could come up to an accord, with the offender admitting the injury or grievance done, along with the admission of his/her accountability of what must be done to reinstate the state of justice. According to (Heather *et al.* 2003).

The established response of the offender could absorb recompense or reimbursement to the victim (genocide survivor); recompense or provision of service to other victims of analogous offenses or to the extensive community; or where suitable, traditional penalty as offered in the penal code. Penalty or castigation should meet appropriate retributive and rehabilitative objectives. A restorative justice approach engrosses involvement of all sides to the crime: victim, offender, and community. In this crossroad, justice has undergone a complete metamorphosis.

The researcher would like to share the evidence of the true things that happened in Rwanda through *Gacaca* courts system. One offender in Rwanda came out to confess to a genocide victim during *Gacaca* courts hearing and mentioned the place where he had piled all the bodies of the victim's family. The widow (victim) had lost all her children and the husband killed by the genocide offender. So, the widow offered forgiveness to the offender and asked him with his family to come and be her immediate neighbour. She provided land for the offender's family to build a home. She asked the

wife of the offender to be her daughter-in-law, the offender to be her son, and the offender's children to be her grandchildren.

Every morning, the survivor-victim would wake up early, prepare and feed her new grandchildren, take them to school, come back home, prepare lunch for them, pick them up back from school, and feed them again. This happened for several years, until the children completed primary school and left home for secondary school. This was because the survivor fully embraced restorative justice, to herself, her offender, and the entire Rwandan community.

It is for such reasons that the researcher sees Paul's address to the Corinthian believers as advocating for the practice of biblical principles that embrace both restorative and retributive justice, when dealing with the conflicts, especially amongst the church members. This is because such an approach involves partaking of all parties to the crime (victim, offender, and community) to find and give the relevant punishment and equal justice to all. Appreciation of retribution as the justification or the "elemental facet of penalty raises the query of the place of the momentous facets of criminal chastisement including prevention (extraordinary prevention of the offender and universal prevention of the community members), rehabilitation and remoteness for the reason of dangerousness" (Greenwalt, 2002).

An unlawful act, minimally, is a contravention of the punitive law. Also, it is an infliction or imposition of injury on the injured party who fairly asks for retribution or restoration. Further, it is a dilapidation of the wrongdoer because the offender has corrupted himself, damaged his own character, and set himself in antagonism to the victim and society (Pope, 1955). Pope's definition of the criminal act is based on Romans 13 which needs to be read together with 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 to produce results

of a complete and equitable justice system to the church and the state, involving both restoration and retribution, based on biblical principles.

Summary

The gap identified in the literature reviewed is that, retributive justice proponents over-emphasize it as the best justice approach to chastise for any offense committed, satisfying the penal law of the state breached and restore moral order. Whereas the restorative justice proponents over-emphasize it as the only right means to render justice because it repairs all the parties involved (the victim, offender, and the community). This study argues for the biblical principles drawn from 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 that merge restorative and retributive justice in resolving any inter or intra conflictual cases, arising from both the church and state. In no way is Apostle Paul, refuting retributive justice, and supporting restorative justice alone, but rather supports both.

For example, in Romans 13, many scholars agree that Paul was advocating for retributive justice approach, which addresses the need for the state to preserve the criminal law through implementation, chastisement and to reinstate the reprobate's moral state because of the imposition and reception of prescribed sentence. In this chapter, Paul does not contradict with 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 or invalidate the secular (state) retributive justice model as being completely irrelevant, but is fighting for Christian maturity and character, to resolve their conflict issues in harmony internally, restoratively, and retributively.

All in all, it may be said that retributive and restorative justice models work together, but the acceptance and contrition of one's actions is essential prior to restitution. It turns out to be obvious that not only at the hypothetical level, but also at the realistic empirical stage, there is a necessity to blend retribution and restoration

justice models to provide equitable justice to all parties. Equitable justice is the true justice suitable for all human life. Application of both retributive and restorative models makes justice equitable and balanced.

CHAPTER THREE

THE BACKGROUND STUDY OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT OF 1 CORINTHIANS

6:1-11

An overview of the Bible Commentators and scholars on 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11

The text to guide this study is 1 Corinthians 6:1-11. It has been chosen because it gives Paul 's approach in addressing conflicts in the Church in Corinth. This text is a portion of a larger text unit of argument about conflict issues in the church of Corinth beginning from 1Corinthians 1:10-17; 3:1-22; 5:1-13 and finally 6:1-11. These are a set of instructions directed to the church in Corinth, which are also relevant to today's church. In fact, the survey conducted by Christianity Today confirms that the major reason for pastors to leave their churches or to be fired are internal church conflicts, lack of proper conflict management and forced exits (Poirier, 2006). This has been the motivation of this study seeking to argue from a biblical perspective that considers principles drawn from 1 Corinthians 6: 1-11. These principles embrace restorative and retributive justice to provide judiciary guidelines that are applicable in the contemporary church and state to resolve and manage social conflicts.

Explaining the meaning of the guiding Text of 1Corinthians 6:1-11

This overview focuses on the meaning of the text as it relates to the church government, its internal conflicts, and the state. 1 Corinthians 6: 1-11 is a portion of a larger text argument of Paul about addressing a divided church in Corinth from 1 Corinthians 1:10-17; 3:1-22 to 5:1-13 over various issues that include leaders, moral standards, idolatry, robbery and the case of incest (1:10-13; 1:14-17; 3:1-4; 3:5-9;10-17; 3:18-22;5:1-5; 5:6-8; 5:9-13) (Buttrick, 1953)

Paul's Address of the Restorative and Retributive Justice in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11

Despite the diverse backgrounds of the church members, church judgments should be done either internally or else they become news headline scandals in the media. In the same line of argument, Buttrick Arthur noted that the relationship of the church to those outside leads to a consideration of the jurisdiction of the courts. He further points out that if Christians are not to judge the outsiders, neither are outsiders to judge the Christians (Buttrick, 1953). The background of Paul's counsel is established in the privileges which Jews possessed in the Roman Empire in applying their own law. Paul does not mean that no secular judge was just. Rather secular judges, as such, could be designated judges and administer fair justice. It is these secular judges who are not esteemed by the church. To the Jews, conflicts were dealt with internally with a restorative mindset (Roness, 2008). To the Greeks, public courts judiciary was part of the normal entertainment through the trio steps: *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* (McCormack, 2014). Paul brings a unifying model of justice to the whole church, despite their backgrounds (1 Corinthians 6:1-11).

In furtherance of the above argument, William Barclay (1978) finds that Paul dealt with the difficulty of particularly pretentious by the Greeks, because the Jews did not ordinarily go to the public courts of law with their conflicts to seek for justice. They settled their conflict issues before the elders of the cities, villages, or (PRC, 2010). To the Jews, justice was something to be settled in a family unit spirit rather than in the legal courts of law. Jewish law particularly forbade a Jew to go to courts of law at all in a non-Jewish courtyard, because doing so was well thought-out blasphemy or profanity in opposition to the divine law (Barclay, 2019). The spirit behind the Jewish court system was restoration, while the spirit behind the Greeks' court system was retribution.

The Greeks were typically a litigious populace who took their law courts as their principal amusement. The Athenian law played a major part in the life of citizens of Athens, and, thus, the condition in Corinth would not be any different. When Athenians had disputes, the first endeavor to resolve it was by a private mediator or arbitrator selected by each rivalry, plus the third impartial judge agreed upon by the two conflicting parties.

If a case failed to be settled in this court, it would be referred to a higher court known as *The Forty* led by a public arbitrator. If the matter was not settled by *The Forty*, it would be referred to as a jury court of law (consisting of 201 citizens). Juries could start with 201 citizens, 401 citizens, continue to 1,000 citizens, up to 6,000 citizens, depending on the weight of the case. Juries were serene of Athenians over 30 years of age (Barclay, 2019). One wonders if the church in this generation should continue to look at justice as a form of entertainment or form of restoring God's people to peace and true justice through peacemaking restoration!

In the Greek city of Athens, all men were lawyers, and washed-out a very great part of their time either deciding or listening to the legal cases. Barclay, therefore, notes that, not extraordinarily, certain Greeks had brought their litigious predispositions into the Christian church and Paul was stunned. Paul's Jewish milieu and Christian principles made the entire fascination seem even more horrendous to him. For Paul, thus, to go to the courts of law, and especially a believer with a believer, was to fall far away below the Christian standard of conduct. It was even far below the Platonian standards which stated that "the good man will always choose to suffer wrong rather than to do wrong (Barclay, 2019)." Could Platonian standards of good men to suffer wrong rather than do wrong theory have influenced Paul's argument for Christians to

suffer wrong and be defrauded for their fellow believers, instead of taking each other to court? (1 Corinthians 6:7).

Based on Greek cultural lifestyles and justice system, the believing Greeks and the few Jews who had probably been influenced by the Greek culture, were litigious over many issues not excluding socio-economic and cultural wrangles. They were also taking their cases to unrighteous and, probably, unbelieving judges for justice as something they enjoyed all the time. To Paul, who had been influenced by Jewish culture and highly transformed by Christian doctrine, this was not just something wrong to him, but also a big shock and astonishment.

A church such as Corinth, with the above-mentioned vices dominating lives of believers and leaders, cannot provide a peaceful environment to run the holy church glorifying Christ. Rather, in this way, the church is contentious, litigious, with members suing each other to courts of law, and may falsely be accusing one another. In this kind of church environment, the glorious gospel of Christ loses meaning and the church's significance is lost, resulting in having ungodly and nominal religious members where the justice of the litigant Christians is provided by the secular courts of law.

Historical Context of the Epistle of First Corinthians

The historical context to the text in this section is set to establish an attempt to understand the uniqueness of the setting of this text. The history of the city of Corinth is fundamentally in two divisions. According to (Schaff, 2002) first, it was a Greek capital, which prospered both before and after the Athenian fifth century golden period. In the first half of the second century B.C, it clashed with Rome, got devastated by Lucius Mummius, the Roman consul in 146 B.C. The capital palace lay dormant for one hundred years, until it was re-established in 44 B.C by Julius Caesar as a Roman protectorate. Corinth was resettled with freed men from Rome.

Second, like any other major city of trade, sexual behaviours and religious conviction thrived all around. Ancient Corinth had such repute for sexual vices to the extent that Aristophanes coined the verb *korinthiazō*, which meant to do something like a Corinthian to be known as to ‘commit fornication’ or ‘adultery.’ The Asclepius area in the modern-day museum in Corinth presents speechless substantiation of this feature of the capital life (Gordon, 1988).

Although there is no mention of the Jewish synagogue by Paul, but the writing synagogue of Hebrews has been found by archaeologists. The speckled portions of proof from Acts, 1 Corinthians, and Romans propose that the church was in numerous ways a mirror or reflection of the capital (Gordon, 1988). As such, Paul’s congregations were of mixed backgrounds and origins, and conflicts in such a congregation were inescapably expected (Gordon, 1988).

The problem of quarrels and wrangles within the church has existed since the New Testament epoch due to differences. The believers in Corinth chopped down the Lord’s principles in numerous ways, and the primary thing singled out to task by Paul was quarrelling.

Quarrelling is a certainty in the church since self-centredness and many other sins are actualities in the church. The consequences of this quarrelling were that God is tarnished, the Son is in disgrace, His people are disheartened and carry harmed reputation, and the world is blocked from faith and established in non-belief and scepticism. MacArthur (2001) reasons that the Lord Jesus as a high priest prayed constantly that His church would exist in unity (John 17:11, 21–23).

Instantaneously after Pentecost, the lately made powerful saints were in ideal harmony and unity with one other—contribution, sharing, merriment, doing adorations, and testifying together (Acts 2:41-47). Their unity brought great harvest in their service

to one other, in their testimony to the world, and in their pleasant and glorious relationship with God. The first and greatest necessity of the church in Corinth was that sort of harmony and unity. Paul, therefore, made an appeal for doctrinal accord, for contrite of their inclination to form factions around glamorous persona, and for having to their memory the enormous main concern of the church, which is preaching the good news (MacArthur, 2001). Paul argued that supernatural unity can occur only when God's wisdom is valued over earthly wisdom and differing personas (1:18–2:16; 3:1–23).

Authorship, date, and place of writing

The Corinthian Epistle states in verse one that the apostle Paul authorship is not questioned. His authorship was unanimously and conventionally accepted by the church from the first century as it appears in the internal evidence of verses 1:1, 13; 3:4–6; 4:15; 16:21 (MacArthur, 2001). The external evidence also supports that the Epistle written by Paul has been accepted as authentic and indisputable since A.D. 95 by Clement of Rome. Other early Christian writers such as Ignatius (about A.D. 110), Polycarp (about A.D. 135), and Tertullian (about A.D. 200), all authenticate Paul as author of the epistle (MacArthur, 2001). Both the internal and external evidence, therefore, support Paul as the author of this epistle.

This epistle was most probably written in the first half of the century around A.D. 55 from the capital of Ephesus (16:8–9, 19) while Paul was on his third missionary journey. The apostle anticipated to stay at Ephesus to finish his three years stay (Acts 20:31) up to Pentecost (May/June A.D.55). Subsequently, he had the expectation to spend his winter (A.D. 55–56) at Corinth (16:6; Acts 20:2). His going away to Corinth was probable while he was writing (4:19; 11:34; 16:8) (MacArthur, 2001).

Occasion, purpose, and audience

There are two situations which decided the instance for the writing of 1 Corinthians. First, he wrote to respond to the letter on evils they had written to him. These evils included the Christian understanding and practice of marriage, the habit of eating meat dedicated to idols, the dressing code of women for public worship, the appropriate celebration of the Lord's Supper, the comparative value of spiritual gifts, and the resurrection of the dead. Second, Paul had gotten the news of indiscretions within the life of the church from the members of Chloe's household. Here, factions had sprung up and a case of incest was being overlooked. Paul mirrored the occasion in writing the letter, displaying cleverness in handling the evils of local congregation. Paul's purpose of writing the letter was to administer the church in a biblically sound manner. First Corinthians, therefore, discloses Paul as an expert administrator or manager (MacArthur, 2020).

Apostle Paul was the first to bring the message of salvation to the Corinthians. He had already spent a considerable amount of time, eighteen months there. Oden (2013) observes that after this time Paul left and went on to preach the Gospel in other cities. The Corinthian church was in a position of easily developing philosophical debates and academic pretentiousness, divided into many factions and prevalence of differing arguments, each with preferred powerful speakers.

The Corinthian church was also known for such problems as jealousy, sexual immorality, and failure to discipline members. It was in the city of Corinth, a cultural cosmopolitan pot with a great diversity of wealth, religion, and moral standards and with a reputation of being fiercely independent (Oden, 2013). The city's prosperity made it ripe for all sorts of corruption. Additionally, idolatry flourished and there were more than a dozen pagan temples employing at least a thousand of prostitutes (1

Corinthians 1: 1 – 6:20). Apostle Paul condemns the idea of taking their conflict cases to the secular judges, consuming meat sacrificed to deities and the doctrine of the resurrection. In passing, he also gives good advice concerning virginity, widowhood, and discourses on spiritual gifts (Oden, 2013).

Literary Context of First Corinthians

Paul wrote First Corinthians as an occasional letter to address specific issues of the church at Corinth. He divided it into three major sections, namely 1: 10-4:21 dealing with divisions in the Church and a misunderstanding of the essence of Christian leadership; 5 – 6 in which Paul discusses the three major issues being committed by the members of the Church – incest, lawsuits, and prostitution; and 7- 16 in which Paul answers specific questions asked by the Corinthians including marriage, spiritual gifts, and counsel for the unmarried (Douglas, 1996).

Genre of First Corinthians

First and Second Corinthians are of epistolary genre of writings belonging to the Pauline corpus which comprised 13 Epistles. In this regard, Carson states that most scholars believe that these two epistles (1st and 2nd Corinthians) do not just make up two writings, but that they are multiple pieces of writings that have been collected (Carson et Douglas 2009). Other scholars dispute that 2 Corinthians holds as many as five or six dissimilar letters. The most frequently used heading for these two is—The first Epistle to the Corinthians and, agreeably, Shmoop underscores that the two books are Epistles that were propelled to the church of Christ in Corinth, and hence one came first and the other came second (Shmoop, 2008)

Following the Pauline prescripts and Greco-Roman epistolary conventions, a study of Paul's letters ought to acquire its foundation from investigation of the formal epistolary construction of the Hellenistic world. Clearly, the first-century

Mediterranean letters are Paul's milieu because letters in the Mediterranean world were remarkably consistent in format from about 300 BCE to 300 CE, whether written in Greek, Latin, or even provincial languages like Aramaic (Randolph, 2012). Numerous suggestions from different scholars have, however, been advanced in the last thirty years, as well as numerous recent scholarly advancements that the method taken regarding the epistle principally as compilation, Hellenistic epistle, rhetorical speech-letter, theological critique, Jewish argumentation, ring composition, gospel exhortation, and topical discourse (Malcolm, 2016). Belleville suggests that 1 Corinthians is a 'request letter', according to the wide composition of a yardstick Hellenistic appeal letter (Belleville, 1987).

The near context of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11

The context of the guiding text provides us with Paul's addresses about strife and factionalism in the church (1 Corinthians 1-4). Paul has heard about specific instances of conduct that undermine the moral integrity of the church community: a prominent member of the church marrying his stepmother (5:1-5), Christian believers taking one another to secular courts (6:1-8), natural and unnatural vices in the church (6:9-11), and sex with prostitutes (6:12-20).

Paul alleges that the first case is both shocking and commonly known as found in 5:1. At the same time, Paul knows that his advice in a previous letter to Corinth is being misinterpreted (5:9). If that conclusion was based on the letter to which he begins responding to in 7:1, then the unnamed source of this information may have been those who brought that letter from Corinth to Ephesus. The specific moral lapses treated in this section involved complex social and economic relationship issues that make Paul's solutions problematic for at least some in his audience (Pheme, 2012). This work should

be carefully done not to misunderstand the intended meaning of Paul to the church at Corinth.

It should be clearly understood that chapters 5 and 6 are more closely related. Therefore, Craig points out that Paul starts by the most dishonourable case of sexual immorality and urges the church to put into effect its own court system (5:1-13). Conversely, Paul calls out some members of the church who have been resorting to secular courts (6:1-11), after which Paul revisits the quandary of sexual immorality (6:12-21). This present passage also maintains the earlier context.

The church's negation to act against the reprobate in 5:2 gives the most outstanding example of their egotism and distrust that Paul would carry out discipline (4:18). For that reason, currently, he implements discipline (5:5). They might distrust his authority (4:19-21), but he proceeds by the power of Jesus (5:4) (Keener, 2005). Although the long discourse begins from chapter one to chapter eight, chapter 5 and chapter 6 are more closely related than all other segments of this long discourse.

In chapter six, Paul first rebukes them for taking one another to secular courts of law with minute affairs and carrying their cases before the 'unrighteous' judges (verses 1-8). Second, he seizes the moment to caution them against countless unpleasant sins, to which they had been previously obsessed (verses 9-11). Third, after cautioning them against the maltreatment of their freedom, he fervently dehorn them from fornication, by various points of view from verse 12 to the end.

In verses 1-8, the apostle rebukes them for taking each other to courts of law with unrighteous judges for minute conflict issues; and therein hold responsible to all vexatious lawsuits. In the preceding chapter, he had led them to chastise monstrous or hideous sins in their midst by church councils. At this juncture, he cautions them to decide disagreements with one another by church-council's guidance and wisdom. The

matter of the believer going to the secular courts of law with another believer (verses 6), could not make them live in close propinquity with each other and could not preserve tranquillity and high-quality understanding of each other.

The fraternal bonded love was broken down through believers' court cases in the secular courts. Christians ought not to vie or fight with one another, for they are brothers and sisters in the Lord. When this is suitably done, prevention of lawsuits and putting to an end quarrels and litigations is possible. In verses (9-11) of the same chapter, Paul seizes an instance to counsel them against many scandalous evils, to which they had been previously obsessed, because these evils would stop them from succeeding God's kingdom (v.9).

Those who were acquainted with religion must have known that heaven was never intended for such evils. The doers of the devil's work can by no means be given God's wages, slightest is not less than death, the just rewards of sin, (Romans 6:23) (Matthew, 17:14). New heaven is unadulterated, pure, and holy, there is never a place for the mischievous sprite (devil worshippers), but barely intended for the saints.

Wider context of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11

The book of 1 Corinthians is the 7th book of the New Testament, and it presents a church that is struggling with depravities. Amidst the numerous rebukes and admonishments about various topics, the author wrote in chapter 6:1-11 about frivolous lawsuits in the church and their dire implications (DeArmond, 2011).

Chapter 5 and chapter 6 of 1 Corinthians are correlated by the premise of judgement. In chapter 5, Paul instructs the community of believers to implement judgement internally, where one of their associates is blameworthy of sexual immorality. The verdict to be conceded is unambiguous excommunication. They should have no supplementary company with this gentleman. While giving this

instruction, the apostle places interest on the limits of any like verdict. The jurisdiction of the church is only over to its own members, but not those outside the church (5.12). No excommunication to the outsiders is to be acceptable. Trying to do so would mean believers should live somewhere out of this world. Paul further expresses the point that believers should not refer the internal conflicts of the church to interlopers or ask worldly judges to adjudicate on conflict issues which happen between Christian believers who many a time belong to the same local congregation. For the non-believers, however, the believers can go to secular courts to adjudicate conflict issues.

The New Testament church was not troubled with formally divided denominations, but the church in Corinth undoubtedly had its splinter groups, if not certainly its divisions, and these divisions may well have been replicated in a variety of legal activities. It was implausible that Paul would have authorized the church in the family of Chloe to sue any of the other household church congregants or allowed the party for Paul or the party for Apollos or the party for Cephas to append to the injury previously brought by their factions by posturing the secular courts to adjudicate on the conflict issues amid them. It was inconceivable that Paul would have allowed a legal action by the church of Corinth going against the church of Philippi or any other of its ecclesiastical neighbours. Postmodern churches have no righter than individual believers to be obsessed with dishonouring Christianity by requesting secular courts to adjudicate on their socio-economic disputes.

Many cases had been brought to court of law such as those that concerned sexual immorality, marrying a divorced stepmother while his father was still living, misappropriation of a woman's dowry, a dispute over inheritance, or even prostitution by the stepmother (Rosner, 1998). The sexual charges seem implausible, as the man's father would have to be involved. Property disputes after the father's death involving

either a dowry (pressed by her relatives) or inheritance (by other children) could be involved (Aasgaard, 2010). The marriage of a woman and her stepson, however, noxious to moral conventions, might have been orchestrated to preserve property within the family (Boydston, 2002)).

This argument seeks to suggest that such cases as disclosed above and many more should never be taken to secular courts of law, but rather to ecclesiastical tribunals to be handled internally, restoratively, and retributively, with the aim of satisfying the victim, the offender, and the community.

Biblical Justice through the Ancient Jewish eyes

The local court of elders meeting by the city gate administered basic justice, whereas harder cases would be taken before the king just as the case of Solomon (1 Kings 3:16-28). Moses was the first example to set up the chain of command scheme of courts in the desert (Exodus 18:1). King Jehoshaphat is accredited with selecting majestic law lords in the towns of Judah (2Chronicles 19:5).

Property edict dealt with the inherited lands, where on the father's demise, his sons alienated the land into equal and the same shares, the first born acquiring twice as much share. Levirate law was applied – where the existing brother had to marry the deceased's widow, and their offspring would take the place of the deceased, thereby protecting his share of the inheritance (Deuteronomy 25:5-10). If the father died leaving daughters only, they would inherit their father's property (Numbers 27:1-11; 36:1-12). Various laws protected the family's ownership of the land.

If poverty forced the owner to sell their property or land, redemption law was in place (himself or a kinsman redeemer), if the redemption was not probable, the land would obviously go back to the owner at jubilee festival, which took place at every 50 years (Leviticus 25:28) (Shalom, 2011).

A person taming land or ground had social errands, such as setting out-of-the-way fraction if his harvest for the underprivileged (the poor) and deprived (the needy) (Leviticus 19:9-10; Deuteronomy 24:19-21) and each of the 7th and 50th year, land was left for fallowing, so that its produce would feed those in need. The law made great efforts to alleviate debts in that interests were prohibited on credit to a fellow Israelite (Exodus 22:24). Similarly, impoverished kinsmen and the land could be redeemed, and slaves automatically could be liberated after several years [Exodus 21:1; Leviticus 25:54; Deuteronomy 15:12].

Very common with the ancient Near East, kings were to cancel the debts to emancipate slaves and lands, such as king Zedekiah did (Jeremiah 34:8-11), although people forced them to slavery again (Shalom, 2011). Justice throughout these generations was more restorative, and fewer cases adjudicated with retribution, contrary to our day, where it is more of retribution justice, and the focus is the state not victim, offender, and community.

Justice through the modern Jewish eyes

Schwarz (2006) argues that the Jewish community cannot comprehend its absolute potential to be people of the promise or covenant, dedicated to the moral principles of righteousness and justice, if they remain in their tribal campsite, shocked by fear, and obsessed by its apparent need to shield itself from every intimidation, genuine and probable. It is factual that appropriate communal device and political voice must be put in place to protect the Jewish populace at jeopardy, because no Jew would have the sumptuousness to follow the more disdainful, Sinai programme.

On the same note, except the Jewish community commences to offer higher priority and main concern to the schema of righteousness (up righteousness) and justice—the programme that began with the first Jew, Abraham—will be bewildered the

means and the ends. That prophetic heritage is why the Jewish people were placed on this world, (Schwarz, 2006). In other words, without the biblical justice (prophetic heritage), the world cannot have any other version that can solve and resolve all human conflicts both restoratively and retributively. Biblical model is the tool required back in place to acquire a balanced and equitable form of justice for the Israelites and the church to shine forth in righteousness!

Justice through the Greek's eyes

Litigants assisted by their co-speakers (usually friends or relatives) proceeded to trial before a jury led by jurors or in what we call “Judges,” today where they delivered their own speeches in a courtroom in a layman’s language and not in a specialized legal terminology. The Litigants perhaps obtained some acquaintance with the operations of the courts of law, both from helping as jurors or by going to the trials, which were regularly held in or close to the business region and worked as a kind of well-known amusement. All cases were listened to and judged between one hour and one day but not more.

The terms “juror/jurors” is a Greek translation for *dikastes/dikastai* which means to the listeners of these forensic communications, others choose the translation of “judge/judges” who carried out the occupation like those both of a modern judge and a modern jury. This system had no specialized-qualified judges to standardize what the jury listened to, to command it in the appropriate law, and to distinguish matters of truth from matters of law. There was no stipulation for petition from the judgement; the Athenian adjudicator exercised justice with enormous authority and, certainly, power (Bers & Adriaan, 2003). This looks pretty the same as the modern person – Christian or non-Christian, who takes every matter to secular courts seeking for justice over every major and minor issues, which has now become the norm.

Summary

In conclusion, Paul affirms that the Corinthian church should judge their own cases straight away through their internal justice systems. In 1 Corinthians chapter 5, he obliges believers to deal with their conflicts internally retributively and restoratively, instead of turning on a blind eye, or even take their cases to the unrighteous judges to seek for justice from unbelievers. In 1 Corinthians chapter 6, he instructs the believers to look for justice from their own wise leaders, and not from outside. This eye-catching coincidence may indicate very close union of communal judgement within the Corinthian community (Richardson, 1983).

Ancient Corinth had such repute for sexual vices to the extent that Aristophanes coined the verb *korinthiazō*, which meant to do something like a Corinthian to be known as to ‘commit fornication’ or ‘adultery.’ The Asclepius area in the modern-day museum in Corinth presents speechless substantiation of this feature of the capital life (Gordon, 1988). As such, Paul’s congregations were of mixed backgrounds and origins, and conflicts in such a congregation were inescapably expected (Gordon, 1988). The problem of quarrels and wrangles within the church has existed since the New Testament epoch due to differences.

The consequences of this quarrelling were that God is tarnished, the Son is in disgrace, His people are disheartened and carry harmed reputation, and the world is blocked from faith and established in non-belief and scepticism. (MacArthur, 2020) reasons that the Lord Jesus as a high priest prayed constantly that His church would exist in unity (John 17:11, 21–23). Instantaneously after Pentecost, the lately made powerful saints were in ideal harmony and unity with one other—contribution, sharing, merriment, doing adorations, and testifying together (Acts 2:41-47). Their unity

brought great harvest in their service to one other, in their testimony to the world, and in their pleasant and glorious relationship with God.

The first and greatest necessity of the church in Corinth was that sort of harmony and unity. Paul argued that supernatural unity can occur only when God's wisdom is valued over earthly wisdom and differing personas (1:18–2:16; 3:1–23).

CHAPTER FOUR

EXEGETICAL ANALYSIS OF 1 CORINTHIANS 6:1-11

Introduction

This chapter seeks to examine the guiding text of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 with the aim of drawing the biblical principles that Paul uses in resolving the Corinthians conflictual issues. The choice of this text is motivated by the fact that it builds on Paul's addresses on the divisive conflicts within the church being taken out to the secular courts, and how they should instead be resolved internally. The exegetical task attempts to analyze the instructions given by Paul in relation to the subject of divisive conflicts existing in the Corinthian church and how they should be resolved amicably, peacefully, and internally using an embedded restorative and retributive approach.

Paul addresses a specific case of a Corinthian believer who was carrying on an incestuous affair with his stepmother which was prohibited both in the Old Testament (Leviticus 18:8; Deuteronomy 22:22) and in the Roman law (Walvoord, 1986). Consequently, chapter 6:1-11 falls between the preceding passage about sexual immorality in 5:1-13, and a subsequent passage of 6:12-23 also dealing with conflict issues including that of sexual immorality in the church. The exegetical process was done using historical grammatical criticism. The Application to the Rwandan case was done with the use of the African Hermeneutical method to get to the "accurate interpretation" (Mburu, 2019) of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11.

The Inter-textual context of justice within 1 Corinthians 6:1-11: Paul's argument for the need of retributive and restorative justice within the church to administer equitable justice over her trivial cases.

Gordon Fee reconstructs the internal context of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 such that a brother (believer A) defrauds another brother (believer B). To gain justice, believer B takes believer A before the civil magistrate at the judgement seat. This seat was assumed to be probably located at the heart of the marketplace (Acts 18:12-17), instead of bringing the case before the church leadership authority (Gordon, 2014). The victim and the offender's case created conflicts, disputes, and division in the church. Paul argues that the reasons for the acts of a brother taking another brother to the courts of law led by unrighteous judges are wrong and shameful. Paul is deeply concerned that such a lifestyle of seeking justice between a brother and another brother from the corrupt civil magistrates of the city promotes anger, resentments, invigorate divisions in the church and hurts the witness of the gospel in Corinth (Gordon, 2014).

Keener, (2005) maintains that, suing a brother or a believer as *New Revised Standard Version* puts it or a spiritual sibling (6:6, 8), as he calls him, though it was quite common, especially in the property disputes, in literal sense, it was a scandalous behaviour. Communities of the resident aliens generally preferred to settle their conflict cases among themselves rather than airing their dirty laundry before the larger society. This was especially the truest way for Jesus' followers (Matt. 5:39-40; Luke 6:29-30). Other philosophers also rejected lawsuits and preferred settling cases by their own wisdom to subjecting them to the unwise world (Keener, 2005).

Therefore Paul, filled with irritability over the wicked scenario in the Corinthian church, does not give any argument as he usually does, but rather alternates statements of horror, rhetorical questions, sarcasm and even threat. The Inter-textual context of

justice in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 can likely be separated into four sub-sections as follows: 6:1-3; 6:4-6; 6:7-8 and 6:9-11.

The first section of this periscope in verses 1- 3 alludes to Paul's argument about the need for retributive and restorative justice within the church. Paul argues in the first place about the saints who are judges of the angels and this world, so they should know that they are able to judge their own matters internally, and not before the unrighteous [courts of law]. As such, saints' internal matters should not be taken before the unrighteous (verses 1); Saints can judge their own matters internally (verse 1); Saints are judges of the angels and this world (verses 2, 3).

Paul begins his argument that the church is fully competent to make judgement over her trivial cases between her congregation members when he begins his discourse to the Corinthians with *Τολμᾷ τις ὑμῶν* (Is anyone of you?). This opening question reveals both the nature of the problem and the depth of the feelings toward this matter that Paul has (Fee, 2014). According to Daniel B. Wallace, the verb *Τολμᾷ* (Dare) is an interrogative present active indicative used in questions, expecting an assertion and a declarative indicative to be made in the answer. The answer is a presentation of certainty (Wallace, 1996).

This means that the believers in the Corinthian church were certainly having cases and were taking each other to the courts of law. This is an affirmed possessive Genitive *ὑμῶν* (of you), followed by the direct object accusative neuter *πρᾶγμα* (a matter or a case) receiving the action of the transitive verb (Wallace, 1996).

In the same line of argument, Antony C. Thiselton underscores that Paul's questions carry the force of an exclamatory expression of censure in verse 1, *How dare any one of you?* (Thiselton, 2000). Similarly, David E. Garland states that "having a case against the other" (*πρᾶγμα ἔχων πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον*) is an idiom for a civil litigation

(Garland, 2003). Keener calls τὸν ἑτερον “the brother” or “the believer” of New Revised Standard Version so strongly as “the spiritual siblings” (Keener, 2005). The unrighteous (τῶν ἀδίκων) in this verse, in all chances, refers to the judges or juries who were arbitrating these litigations.

Winter (2002) however, argues that the “unrighteousness” of these juries stems from their corrupt practices and methods used in the Roman court systems on the one hand. On the other hand, other scholars believe that the term is used to designate the position of salvific standing before God, the judge of all judges and nations of the world (Winter, 2002).

This researcher’s position on this argument is that it is both true that the juries in Paul’s mind are not saved and they have no salvific standing with God, whereas it perhaps was true that they were offering justice in the corrupt manner. He asserts that if the Roman justice system were upright, perhaps Paul would have said something about it to clarify that the “unrighteousness” was referring to the salvific state of the juries.

In the above case, it makes justice more complicated and impossible as the rich will always get justice against the poor because they are not able to pay the bribes to the juries, who are entitled to give them justice over their cases. The nature and extent of the judgement is unknown in the text from Paul’s rhetoric question “Or don’t you know that the saints will judge the world”? Here, Garland finds that since God is the one who judges the world (Rom. 3:6), it may be best to understand the saints’ judging as relating to ruling the world (Garland, 2003). In a similar vein of argument, Antony Thiselton discloses that the idea of saints adjudicating the world is indicated and specified in Scripture as well as in Jewish apocalyptic factions such as the Qumran Community (Dan. 7:22; Matt. 19:28; Rev. 2:26,20:4) (Thiselton, 2000).

Paul's assertion is simply that, If the saints are competent enough to judge or rule the world, can't they handle a trivial or tribunal case or matter amongst themselves? The judgement proceeds from the world (v. 2) to angels (v. 3). In this regard, John MacArthur argued that, the question of which type of angels (fallen or holy) and the exact judgement (judge or govern) over them is also debated and unknown (MacArthur, 2020).

The fundamental point in this verse still stands: If the saints are to judge and rule over the world and over angels in the age to come, are they surely not able to settle matters or trivial cases pertaining to life among themselves? After all, Wallace describes the cases as "smallest cases" to be genitive of comparison because "the cases" is followed by the adjective genitive "smallest" category (Wallace, 1996). These "cases" are described as the adjectival descriptive genitive category because they are described as "smallest" (Wallace, 1996). No one should, therefore, think of these cases as bigger or even criminal cases, which require highly trained and skilled professional jury. Rather, Paul argues that there are "wise men" within the church to handle and resolve such cases.

The second section of this scripture periscope in verses 4 – 6 points to Paul's argument to set a system for retributive and restorative justice within the church. In this section, Paul argues that it is a shame for saints having law courts of life matters to appoint the unbelieving despised judges outside the church to decide between brothers: the saints have law courts of life matters and are seeking justice (v.4); the saints take their cases of life matters before the despised and unbelieving instead of taking them to the wise judges in the church. This is a shame. (verses 5,6)

The context which precedes 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 is chapter 5:1-12 and the context which follows it is 1 Corinthians 6:12-20. This context draws the framework

out of which Paul builds his arguments on the need for retributive and restorative justice in the church.

All of chapters five and 6:12-20 are all about sexual immorality in the Corinthian church. Paul is astonished that a man has his father's wife probably – his stepmother and is allowed in the church fellowship. Paul says that such immorality is not even heard of amongst the pagans. Here, Paul rebukes believers for their arrogance and lack of self – discipline in the church body from which he passes judgement over this man as if he is there himself (verses 4 – 5). And the church is supposedly to hand over the habitually sinning man over to Satan outside the church to create space in the man's life for repentance and restoration into the fellowship (verse 5).

In verses 6 and the following verses, Paul uses the analogy of leaven and the sacrifice of Christ, to admonish the believer to strive for moral excellence and to abandon the sin of sexual immorality. He finally corrects the Corinthians' misunderstandings about not associating with sexually immoral people.

Paul, in a likely sardonic tone, says all the above, to the Corinthians' shame in verse 5 as receiving shame from Paul's teaching in relation to their behaviour towards each other. Paul's idea here is that he does not have a particular wise man in the Corinthian church, but instead any man who is wise in the church can judge between the cases of the believers (Wallace, 1996).

Paul brings his argument in verse 6 with more exclamatory statement as “Instead, [a] brother goes to law against [a] brother, and this before unbelievers!” The word ἀλλὰ is contrastive or adversative conjunction suggesting a contrast or opposing thought to the idea in verse 5, here translated as instead (Wallace, 1996) μετὰ (against) with a Genitive and Accusative is Association conjunction referring to the two brothers (believers) who belong and are in the church (Wallace, 1996) καὶ (and) is a continuative

connective conjunction connecting an additional idea of the last clause of verse 6 (Wallace, 1996). Beleaguered by arrogance, the Corinthians should have been ashamed of their behaviour, for they were not even wise enough to settle or judge (διακρίναι) a dispute or a case between their own church members (Biblica, 2021).

In verses 7-8, Paul highlights the necessity for retributive and restorative justice within the church. In this section, Paul argues that it would be better to suffer wrong or be defrauded than to have lawsuits against one another which is a total defeat already and unjust actions (v 7-8).

In verse 7, Paul takes his thoughts further with, “now therefore,” at once looking at the preceding thought in verse 6 of a brother (believer) going to the law with another brother (believer) and brings it under a special consideration as Marvin writes (Marvin, 1997). Paul writes in verse 7 that “to have lawsuits against one another at all, it is already a defeat for you”. The noun ἥττημα (defeat) is a subject nominative neuter referring to the believers taking each other to court (Wallace, 1996) διὰ (because) with accusative is a causal conjunction expressing the basis or ground of suffering the wrong (Wallace, 1996). It is an indirect middle indicative because the subject is acting on itself (themselves) or it could be passive because the subject is acted upon or receives the action expressed by the verb (Wallace, 1996) Τί (Why) is an interrogative pronoun used adverbially asking an identifying question especially when a person is in view (Wallace, 1996).

In Paul’s view, no matter who wins or loses the lawsuit, all are defeated spiritually as writes Garland (Garland, 2003). One would easily ask, why does Paul so strongly assert like this? The answer to this is, because the believers’ litigious spirit betrays moral deficiency and reveals the triumph of selfishness over love, something Paul addresses in verse 13.

Paul calling on the Corinthians to lay down their arrogance, he asks them two rhetoric questions: “Why not rather suffer wrong?” “Why not rather be defrauded?” The term ἀποστερεῖσθε (defrauded) literally means “to deprive of one what is due.” Paul underscored to the Corinthians that for the sake of preserving their Christian witness and the Gospel, they should just be cheated and endure suffering the wrongdoing, for the sake of the kingdom of God. Paul affirmed and applied Jesus’ teaching principle of, “turn the other cheek” in (Matthew 5:39), as he does throughout his writings (1Thessalonians 5:15; Romans 12:17).

Thus, in verse 8, Paul writes stressing to the Corinthians that instead of being wronged, cheated, or even defrauded, they were rather doing such to the others, even to the people they were supposed to love most – their brothers (fellow believers) as (DeArmond, 2011) says.

Watering down the essence, power, and importance of the Gospel by the Christian believers due to non-Christian behaviour is very common today in the Rwandan church and non-Christian communities alike, all in the name of individuals fighting for their rights and freedom over trivial cases. The believers no longer want to hear the Gospel such as Paul preaches to the Corinthian church, that “*a believer*” should not take a fellow “*believer*” to the courts of law because of retrieval litigations. They should be willing to be defrauded or wronged instead of bringing shame and disguise on the precious Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Christ and His Gospel are being ashamed everywhere, every day owing to insensitive behaviours of professing Christians against others, together with several cases of sexual immorality among the clergy and church laity. These kinds of ill-Christian-vices and behaviours have badly soaked down the glory of Christ’s Gospel in

the ears of both believing and non-believing communities, and Christianity is slowly becoming a dead religion like all others in the world.

In verses 9-11, Paul's argument is that even the Saints were formerly unrighteous and were beneficiaries of the restorative justice. Here, what Paul is saying is that the saints before their conversion, before they were washed, sanctified, and justified, they were like the unrighteous. These unrighteous have not experienced the restorative justice and, therefore, they will not inherit the kingdom of God. Paul lists some of them in verses 9 to 10.

From verses 9-10, Paul seems to give threatening warnings to the Corinthians about their immoral behaviour, comparing it to the corrupt magistrates in the earlier verses of this passage of scripture and a host of other wicked people in the immediate passage, thereby asking another rhetorical question in verse 9, or *don't you know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God?* "Or" (ἢ) is a disjunctive (alternative) conjunction used to give an alternative possibility to the idea to which it is connected in verse 8 (Wallace, 1996).

οἴδατε (You know) is a Perfect with a present force active indicative here used as present tense state verb with little distinction between the action and its results to emphasize what the Corinthian Church is supposed to know. In this case, the verb is a resultative perfect, pointing out that the act itself has virtually died; the results have become the act (Wallace, 1996).

(The unrighteous) is independent or substantival adjective nominative masculine plural here functioning as a substantive implying a noun or taking a lexical nuance of a noun (Wallace, 1996). κληρονομήσουσιν (will inherit) is a predictive future active indicative third person singular indicating that it will come to pass that, truly the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God.

πλανᾷσθε is a second person plural Prohibition Present Imperative Middle or Passive – a negative command commonly used to forbid an action. Cognate μὴ is used before imperative to turn the command into the prohibition (Wallace, 1996). οὗτε (Nor) is Correlative or paired Conjunction used to express various relationships in verse 9 (Wallace, 1996). βασιλείαν (the Kingdom) is accusative direct object feminine singular noun here receiving the action of the verb which is (κληρονομήσουσιν).

In this regard, Garland argues that the kingdom of God may refer either to the kingdom of God in heaven; or to the church on earth - most probably the former (Garland, 2003). Agreeing with Garland, Barnes finds that the image, arguably, is derived from Jesus' teachings (Matt. 25:34). Here, Paul assumed that since God's kingdom is marked by righteousness, the unrighteous can have no part in it (Barnes, 1972).

In verse 10, Paul admonishes the Corinthian believers not to separate themselves from the lost world, but rather to keep themselves away from the so-called believers in Christ, who live their lives like heathens. He draws his conclusion later in verse 12-13 by disclosing that he and the church have no authority to judge the lost, but they should exercise church discipline over the ones claiming to be believers. The kind of justice required to apply in the sexual immorality cases in the church (whether from chapter five or six) are such kinds as should never be taken to the secular courts of law for securing justice between the church members and/or leaders.

They are good examples of social conflict cases (trivial or tribunal cases) that should not require state retributive justice to be applied here but should be handled by the church leadership authority using the wisdom from the scripture and the teaching of God's word. Imagine taking sexual immorality cases to state judges to judge between the sinning and the righteous believers, whereas the judge or prosecutor himself or

herself might be sexually immoral! Will the victim get true justice from the corrupt prosecutor or judge? Will this justice be achievable and equitable?

Paul proceeds to verse 11, where he writes that *τινες* (some) Corinthian believers *ἦτε* (were) doing *ταῦτά* (such things) mentioned above. Paul, here, uses the word *ἀλλὰ* (but) three times to indicate the contrast of the new life in Christ with the worldly life he describes (MacArthur, 2020).

Writing to Corinthians, Paul points out *ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε* (but you were washed), which literally means to be remitted or cleansed. Scholars have debated a lot on the nature of this type of “washing” whether it is church historical salvific washing which occurs at (“baptism”) – very foundational for believing of the true Gospel of Christ and the believer is completely washed from all sin and is made righteous in Christ Jesus.

Furthermore, Thomas C. Oden argues that Paul uses the phrase, *ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε* (but you were sanctified) – initial break away from the power and practice of sin to the love of the Son of God, which occurs at regeneration (Acts 20:32; Romans 6:11; 2Corinthians 5:17) (Oden, 2013). This conversion and regeneration put us in a position to be judges of angels, the world, and, therefore, our own matters mentioned in verses 1 and 2. This, in turn, gives us a standard above the unrighteous judges, particularly as far as restorative and retributive justice is concerned.

Paul concludes his warning by giving explanation as to why they cannot live the same way as they were, *ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε* (but you were justified) – a justification by grace. The Corinthians were put in the right standing (relationship) with God. Paul ends his discussion by stating to the Corinthians emphatically that “they were washed, sanctified and justified in the name of Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God” a completed work by Christ!

Intra-textual Evidence in the Justice System of the Greco-Roman world

An exegetical analysis of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 was done by putting across evidence presented by Paul in the passage to understand the justice arguments put forward. Keener notes that the Greco-Roman society as well as Corinth were disreputably litigious. Many of the ancient lawsuits addressed property matters among the wealthy; some grievances were simply pretexts for avenging insults and pursuing enmity. The arbiters, who usually settled these property disputes, were also of high status (6:4).

People of higher status charged those of the lower status, but it was considered inappropriate for those of the lower status (also less credible and having more to gain) to charge those of the higher status. Once a magistrate had the case, he summoned the accused. When the accused arrived, he assigned the case as appropriate to the jury (judge), but if the parties agreed to settle the matters privately, then it was given to an arbitrator (Keener, 2005).

The fact here is that in the secular courts of law, worldly status constituted a major factor for the case evaluation and judgement – where justice always favoured the rich against the poor. This contrasts with all Paul has been arguing in this letter since (1:26) where justice should be equitable for all and should be handled internally.

The Biblical Principles drawn from 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 that argue for the complementarity of retributive and restorative justice used to develop an equitable Biblical Gacaca for the church and the state include among others the following:

1. The Superiority Principle: The saints are judges of the angels and this world. Therefore, they are able to judge their own conflictual matters internally, without taking them to the unrighteous judges (Verses 1-3)

2. The Reputation Principle: It is a shame for saints/believers to take their life matters to the unbelieving despised judges in the courts of law outside the church to decide between the conflicting believers (Verses 4-6)
3. The Self Sacrificial or Self Defeat Principle: It is better to suffer wrong or be defrauded than to take a brother to unrighteous Judges, for this is a total defeat and an unjust action (Verses 7-8)
4. The Transformation Principle: The saints have a good experience in understanding matters of this life, since before being washed, sanctified, and justified, they were like the unrighteous who will not inherit the kingdom of God. Therefore, they cannot go back to behave the same way like the non-righteous (Verses 9-11).
5. The Cultural Principle: Paul's Christian worldview could have been informed by the ancient Jewish worldview about restorative worldview, which sought out more restorative family unit-oriented justice, than the litigious Greek retribution. This is in line with the ancient Rwandan *Gacaca* – justice on the grass (lawn), which was always conducted by the Elders of the city or the village. Since this is more African in the way justice was and still is made, it should be adopted for church and community use even in the 21st century generation.

Summary

In this chapter, the researcher sought to examine 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 to draw out biblical principles that bring out a biblical restorative and retributive justice approach to the church and the state, in conflict resolution management. The researcher demonstrated how this text directly addresses conflicts within the Church and how they should be resolved internally to attain a complete form of equitable justice retributively and restoratively.

The exegetical task attempted based on the translation of the Greek text and its syntactical functions analyzed the instructions given by Paul in relation to the subject of conflicts existing in the Corinthian church and how they should be resolved internally, amicably, and peacefully in what turns to be retributive and restorative justice mode. The researcher showed that this proposition is supported by several evidence discussed in the exegetical process, which was done using historical grammatical criticism and some aspects from socio-scientific criticism.

To the text in 1 Corinthians 1: 6 -11, the preceding and subsequent passages in 5:1-13 and 6:12-23 respectively, talk about sexual immorality. The texts also deal with conflict issues of sexual immorality in the church, which points out the fact that there were issues that should have been tried internally within the church for a justice that it is retributive and restorative at the same time. Verses 9-11 list vices belonging to an argument against a brother within the church taking another brother to court. Paul had pointed out that this is a shame.

CHAPTER FIVE:

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

The research discussed the biblical restorative and retributive justice, the church, and the state conflict resolution approach. Its aim was to identify biblical principles in 1 Corinthians 6: 1 – 11 that define the restorative and retributive justice approach to address conflicts and divisions within the church and the community in general.

In this chapter, the researcher presents a summary of the findings, synthesizing the results of the study with reference to its objectives. The researcher makes recommendations for each of the objectives before proceeding to conclusion in answering the research questions and providing suggestions for further research.

Summary of the Findings and Recommendations

In this part, the researcher presents the summary of the research findings in view of the research objectives before moving on to the recommendations. This study sought to prove that biblical restorative justice using Pauline principles, rather than retributive justice standing alone as commonly found in State retributive judicial system, resolves conflicts of the church and state effectively. A deductive exegetical analysis of Paul's instructions in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 supports this restorative justice approach intertwined with retributive justice approach to give equitable balanced justice. Historical grammatical criticism with some aspects from socio-scientific criticism used in the analysis of the text provided a space to hear the message of the text in its original context of the ancient Greco-Roman world, which informs the guiding conflict resolution principles for the church and the state in the contemporary society.

The study had two objectives and the following paragraphs summarize how they were achieved and the recommendations thereto.

The first objective was to conduct an exegetical deductive study of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 while drawing out biblical principles Paul used to contextualize the concept of justice and conflict resolution in the Corinthian Church. In achieving this objective, the researcher did a biblical exegetical deductive analysis of the 1 Corinthian 6:1-11, using historical grammatical criticism, with some aspects from socio-scientific criticism.

He drew from the Greek text to thoroughly examine and study the pericope; translated the text and then drew the syntactical outline to underline the biblical principles that can be used to develop guiding principles that would be used to resolve conflicts and divisions within church and the community.

These principles revolve around Paul's model of retributive and restorative judicial system to be implemented in the church, and to complement to the over-emphasized state retributive judicial system.

Recommendation: In the contemporary society, believing and non-believing judges are appointed to administer justice to all people including believers. On the contrary from the study of the text of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11; true justice between the believer against another believer, especially in matters of internal social conflicts from within the church, should be handled by the wise believers in the church, who have been washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of Jesus Christ and by the Holy Spirit.

The second objective was to set guidelines that define the complementarity of the restorative and retributive justice in preventing, managing, and resolving conflicts within the church and the state.

The researcher achieved this objective by discussing the biblical principles which can be grouped into mainly two categories: the inter-textual context of justice within 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 that describes Paul's argument on the need for retributive and restorative justice within the church; this also covered the immediate and far contexts of the text, and the intra-textual context (away from the text) of justice system of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11; but in the Greco-Roman world.

Therefore, the researcher achieved this objective by studying the translated text of 1 Corinthians 6: 1 – 11, and the context behind the text, to draw all-time biblical justice principles and upon which the guiding principles for the complementarity of restorative and retributive justice which can be built up in resolving conflicts in the church and community.

Recommendation 1: The concept of conflict resolution model and provision of retributive and restorative justice, conceptualized in the Corinthian church as was addressed by Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 and from other Pauline corpus, is applicable in the church and state litigations and should be adopted.

The deductive study of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 gives biblical principles for managing and resolving conflicts for which guidelines are developed. These guidelines are usable in the contemporary church and the state. They should be used to develop a Biblical Restorative and Retributive Justice for the Church and state Conflict Resolution Approach.

These guidelines are of paramount importance in helping the church councils of the Rwandan church, the Rwanda Governance Board and other related state judiciary systems to resolve existing conflicts and manage the future ones by providing guiding principles towards equitable justice restoratively and retributively.

Recommendation 2: The church should discern wise believers, able to administer equitable retributive and restorative justice to church members who have conflicts among themselves. In the same vein, the church should adopt judiciary guidelines based on biblical principles drawn from the study of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 to instil a restorative and retributive justice model within the church, which can also complement the over-emphasized existing state retributive justice system.

This will lead to the “Biblical *Gacaca*,” a judiciary system that embodies the retributive and restorative justice in the church and state while allowing the church to settle its internal matters with no outsiders’ intervention. Such a “Gacaca” has enough biblical and Godly wisdom and values, as demonstrated in this study, to offer reconciliatory conducive environment for restorative and retributive justice.

The “Biblical Gacaca” should also be adopted to deal with all forms of conflicts within the church and the community in general. In avoidance of the shame from taking a fellow believer into secular courts of law to face mainly retributive justice and in reference to this “Biblical Gacaca,” it is recommended that every church build a judicial system which is both retributive and restorative and founded on biblical principles.

Summary

This chapter dealt with the summary of the findings where the results of the study were synthesized with reference to its objectives. The researcher demonstrated how the two objectives of the study were achieved. The researcher made recommendations in relation to each of the objectives.

The researcher concludes that Paul’s model, presented in 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11, can help to identify biblical principles which serve to develop a conflict resolution approach for equitable justice restoratively and retributively for both the church and the

state. That model in its “Biblical *Gacaca*” tone presents some similarities and dissimilarities with the Rwandan “*Gacaca*” justice model.

The Rwandan *Gacaca* courts, even though they did not settle all the matters involved (like some unresolved retribution issues in the community), at least it proved that restorative and retributive justice is more effective to resolve conflicts in a more African societal setting, like those of Genocide, rather than only applying state retributive judicial system to every form of human conflicts, particularly in such cases as church and community conflicts.

It is possible to develop, within the church, an approach based on biblical principles that are retributive and restorative, usable for both the church and the state. These principles offer a unique contribution of the church to equitable justice within the church and comments the sole overarching state retributive approach to justice.

Suggestions for further studies

In view of the findings of this study, particularly all –time biblical justice principles that define the elements of a Bible based approach to instilling retributive and restorative justice in the church and state, the areas for further study can be the historical church and state relationship in administering justice to church members. In addition, the contribution of the church in the state judiciary system and the church integral mission to the community can be another area of study which would extend the current one.

Conclusion

This research identified biblical principles in 1 Corinthians 6:1 – 11 that define the restorative and retributive justice principles, to address conflicts and divisions within the church and the community in general. The study pursued two objectives which were achieved by conducting an exegetical deductive study of 1 Corinthians 6:

1- 11 to draw biblical principles that Paul used to contextualize the concept of justice and conflict resolution in the Corinthian Church and by setting biblical principles that define the complementarity of the restorative and retributive justice in resolving conflicts within the church and the state.

In chapter one, the researcher recognized the argument that Paul's model of church conflict resolution in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11 is appropriate for providing both retributive and restorative justice. He showed that the Church has the most appropriate means to address, resolve conflicts and reconcile the conflicting members using biblical principles with no need to go to the secular courts.

Biblical principles as those that are drawn in the study of 1 Corinthians 6: 1 – 11, merging the complementarity between restorative and retributive justice are needed to resolve the church and state conflicts. In chapter two, the researcher demonstrated that the biblical principles are lacking in the literature review for the application of both retributive and restorative models to make justice equitable and balanced.

And in chapter three with the background study of 1 Corinthians 6: 1- 11 coupled with chapter four, the researcher found those biblical principles that led him to clarify the findings and make recommendations in chapter 5 on the possibility to advance, within the church, an approach grounded on biblical principles. The researcher ended the thesis with suggestions to further research in, for instance digging deeper into the historical church and state relationship in administering justice to church members.

References

- Aasgaard, R. (2010). Religion, Christian Views of Greek and Roman. In G. M. al., *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome* (pp. 210-2011). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Adams, S. E. (2016). *Pillars in the History of Biblical Interpretation, Volume 2 - Social Scientific Criticism*. Ontario, Canada: McMaster Divinity College Press.
- al., F. C. (2016). *Festschrift in honour of Allan Boesak: A life in Black Liberation Theology*. Western Cape, South Africa: Stellenbosch, AFRICA SUN MeDIA.
- Alexander, L. (2013). You Got what you deserved. Criminal Law and philosophy: Criminal Law and Philosophy (Forthcoming). *San Diego Legal Studies Paper No. 12-085*, 309-319.
- Alice, M. (1998). *The in-between church: Navigating size transitions in congregations*. Washington DC, USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. Retrieved from Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Allen, A. (2017, 05 15). *Christian Mediation*. Retrieved from www.coloradochristianmediation.com:https://www.coloradochristianmediation.com/blog/2017/5/9/biblical-conflict-resolution
- Amnesty, I. (2002). *Rwanda Gacaca: a question of justice*. London: AI.
- Annie, H. M. (2016). When Christ's Body is broken: Anxiety, Identity and Conflict in the congregations. *Journal of Pastoral Theology*, 217-219.
- B, D. E. (2014). Ethnicity and civil war. *Journal of Peace Research*, 51(2), 199-212.
- Barbra, M. (2020, 03 17). *Religion and Conflict with special focus on East Africa*. Copenhagen, USA: Danish Institute for International Studies.
- Barclay, W. (2019). *Commentary on 1 Corinthians 1 William Barclay's Daily Study Bible*. Glasgow: Presbyterian Publishing Corporation.
- Barnes, A. (1972). *Barnes' notes on the Old and New Testaments*. Michigan, USA: Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Belleville, L. (1987). *Continuity or Discontinuity. A Fresh Look at 1 Corinthians in the Light of First-Century Epistolary Forms and Conventions*. Delaware, Ohio: Catholic Biblical Association.
- Bengel, J. A. (2018). *John Albert Bengel's Gnomon of the New Testament: Pointing out from the natural force of the words, the simplicity, depth, harmony and saving power of its divine thoughts. : . Philadelphia: Perkinpine & Higgins*.

- Biblica. (2021, 07 01). *International Bible Society*. Retrieved from www.biblica.com: <https://www.biblica.com/resources/scholar-notes/niv-study-bible/intro-to-1-corinthians/>
- Bizimana, J. D. (2017). [Bizimana Jean Damascene /ES -author] *National Commission for the Fight against Genocide. (05 May 2017). Testimonies and needs of Genocide Survivors. Retried on June 30th, 2021; from https://ibuka.rw/assets/img/links/links/7.pdf*. Kigali: CNLG Annual Report.
- Blosch, W. D. (2006). *Clergy Overboard: A biblical response to Pastoral termination*. Florida, USA: Amazon Publishers.
- Books, C. (2008). *Holy Bible: English Standard Version Study Bible*. Leicester, England: Crossway Books Publishers.
- Boydston, B. (2002, Jan 29). <https://www.sermoncentral.com/sermons/body-talk-bradley-boydston-sermon-on-faith-43036>. Laveen, Arizona, USA.
- Breckinridge. (1968). *Biblical and theological studies*. . Michigan, USA: Grand rapids: Distributed By Baker Book House.
- Brown, B. (2020, 06 10). *Shame Resilience Theory*. Retrieved from www.positivepsychology.com: <https://positivepsychology.com/shame-resilience-theory/>
- Buttrick, G. A. (1953). *The Interpreter's Bible*. New York: Abingdon Press.
- Campbell, D. A. (2017, December 22). *Paul wrote 1 Corinthians to a community in the middle of a culture war*. Retrieved from www.christiancentury.org: <https://www.christiancentury.org/article/critical-essay/paul-wrote-1-corinthians-community-middle-culture-war>
- Charles, T. F. (1990). *The Thompson Chain-Reference Bible*. USA: . Indianapolis, USA: The B.B. Kirkbridge Bible Co., Inc.
- Charles, V.-V. (2006). *Traditional Justice, Restoration and Prosecution. In handbook of Restorative Justice*. New York, USA: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Costello, E. M. (2016). *Justice for Whom? The Gacaca courts and Restorative Justice for Survivors of Sexual Violence in Rwanda*. Michigan, USA: University of Michigan Publishing House.
- D, M. (1992). The Responsibilities and the Rights of Victims of Crime. *Jstor Publications*, 482-496.
- Daly, K. (2002). *Restorative justice: the real story. Kathleen Daly reviews the discourse that has reformed restorative justice as the antidote to punishment*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Damascène, B. J. (2017, 05 05). *National Commission for the Fight against Genocide: Testimonies and needs of Genocide Survivors*. Retrieved from www.cnl.gov.rw:

https://cnlg.gov.rw/fileadmin/templates/documents/Testimonies_and_Needs_of_Genocide_Survivors__2017.pdf

- Dandurand, Y. (2006). *Handbook on Restorative Justice Programmes. In Crime, United Nations office on drugs and criminal justice handbook series*. New York, USA: United Nations Publishers.
- David, H. C. (2017). *Christians remain world's largest religious group, but they are declining in Europe*. Washington D.C, USA: <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/04/05/christians-remain-worlds>.
- David, H. G. (2010, 120-140). Idol-Food, Idolatry and Ethics in Paul: Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism and Christianity. *Index Theologicus: International Bibliography of Theology and Religious Studies*, 120-140. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/6102602/Idol_Food_Idolatry_and_Ethics_in_Paul
- DeArmond, A. (2011, 05 01). *An exegetical study on 1 Corinthians*. Retrieved from www.austind90.files.wordpress.com: <https://austind90.files.wordpress.com/2011/05/an-exegetical-study-on-1st-corinthians-6.pdf>.
- DeMaris, D. N. (2009, 10 27). *Understanding the Social World of the New Testament*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge Publishing. Retrieved from www.routledge.com: <https://www.routledge.com/Understanding-the-Social-World-of-the-New-Testament/Neufeld-DeMaris/p/book/9780415775823>
- Dictionary, O. E. (2021, 07 14). *The definitive record of the English language*. Retrieved from www.oed.com: <http://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/11125>
- Donald, M. (2017, January 05). *Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11*. Retrieved from donaldmacleod.org.uk: <https://donaldmacleod.org.uk/dm/exegesis-of-1-corinthians-61-11/>
- Douglas, C. a. (2009). *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Michigan, USA: Zondervan Publishing House. Michigan, USA: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Douglas, D. J. (1996). *New Bible Dictionary*. Leicester, England: Inter-varsity Press.
- E, A. C. (1997). *Crucial Questions about Spiritual Warfare (Three Crucial Questions)*. Michigan, USA: Baker Academic.
- Equity. (2011, May 8). *Merriam-Webster.com. 2011*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com>. Retrieved from www.Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary: <http://www.merriam-webster.com> Dictionary
- Eric, H. D. (2006). "The Occasional Nature, Composition, and Structure of Paul's Letters," The Thirty-fifth Annual Sidney B. Sperry Symposium. *Religious Studies Center: How the New Testament Came to Be*, 190–207.
- Eric, H. D. (2006). The Occasional Nature, Composition, and Structure of Paul's Letters. *Religious Studies Center: How the New Testament Came to Be*, 190-207.

- Foucher, R. (2018, February 7). *The character of God: Types of Justice*. Retrieved from characterofgod.org: <https://characterofgod.org/types-justice/>
- Fuller, L. K. (2016). *When Christ's body is broken: Anxiety, Identity, and Conflict in congregations*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Gandhi, G. K. (2016, 01 01). *Types of Justice* . Retrieved from www.lifepersona.com: <https://www.lifepersona.com/the-4-major-types-of-justice>
- Garland, D. E. (2003). *1Corinthians (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament)*. Michigan, USA: Grand Rapids, Baker Academic.
- Gavrielides, T. (2014). Reconciling the Notions of Restorative Justice and Imprisonment. *The Prison Journal*, 479-505.
- George, B. (2018). *Relationship between the Emotional Intelligence of the Lead Clergy and The church Growth in North America*. . Piedmont, USA: Piedmont International University.
- Gerry, J. (2011). *Restorative justice: Ideas, Values, Debates*. Abington, Oxford, UK: Reutlege Publishers.
- Gordon, F. (2014). *The First Epistle to the Corinthians, Revised Edition, NICNT*. Michigan, USA: Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Gordon, F. D. (1988). *The New International Commentary of the New Testament*. Michigan, USA: Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Greenwalt, K. (2002). *Punishment, in Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice*. Thousand Oaks, Canada: Sage Publications.
- Grimsrud, T. (2002). Rethinking God, Justice, and Treatment of Offenders. Offender Rehabilitation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 253-279.
- Hadley, M. L. (2001). *Spiritual Justice*. New York, USA: State University of New York Press.
- Halverstadt, H. F. (1991). *Managing Church Conflict*. Louisville, Kentucky, USA: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Harrell, P. (2003). *Rwanda's gamble: gacaca and a new model of transitional justice*. New York: New York, USA: Writers Club Press.
- Harry, Z. &. (1998). Fundamental Principles of Restorative Justice. , . *The Contemporary Justice Review*, 47-55.
- Hart, B. (2019, 01 02). *Conflict in the work place*. Retrieved from www.excelatlife.com: https://www.excelatlife.com/articles/conflict_at_work.htm
- Heather, S. L. (2003). Repairing the harm: The Victim and the restorative Justice. *Australian National University*, 15-40. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228799673_Repairing_the_harm_Victims_and_restorative_justice

- Hermann, J. L. (2017). Restorative Justice and Retributive Justice: An Opportunity for Cooperation or an Occasion for Conflict in the Search for Justice. *Seattle journal for social justice*, 71-81.
- Hicks, Q. D. (2010). *A study of conflicts within churches that lead to the termination of Pastors within the Southern Baptist Convention*. Lynchburg, Virginia , USA: Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary Publishers.
- Holladay, H. J. (2007). *Biblical Exegesis: A Beginner's Handbook*. Louisville, USA: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Hornby, S. A. (1995). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. Oxford England: Oxford University Press.
- Howard, Z. (2002). *Restorative Justice*. Philadelphia, USA: Good Books Publishers.
- III, B. W. (2009). *The indelible image: the theological and ethical thought world of the New Testament* . Illinois, USA:: Downers Grove Academic.
- Jeffrey, J. (2021, 07 15). *Long-Term Consequences of Criminal Convictions*. Retrieved from [www.freeadvice.com: https://www.freeadvice.com/legal/long-term-consequences-of-criminal-convictions/](https://www.freeadvice.com/legal/long-term-consequences-of-criminal-convictions/)
- Jeffrie, H. J. (1998). *Forgiveness and Mercy* . Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- John, B. (2000). Decomposing a Holistic Vision of Restorative Justice. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 433-440 .
- John, H. C. (1994). *Gospel in Paul: Good News and the Integrity of 1 Corinthians*. . Edinburgh, Scotland: T&T Clark Publishers.
- John, M. (2016). *English Standard Version*. Wheaton, Illinois, USA: Crossway Publishers.
- Johnson, K. (2012 , June 12). *Interfaith: Apocrypha: III Corinthians*. Retrieved from [www.amazon.com: https://www.amazon.com/Third-Corinthians-Ken-Johnson-ebook/dp/B008B82IKI](https://www.amazon.com/Third-Corinthians-Ken-Johnson-ebook/dp/B008B82IKI)
- K, G. (2012). *Ethos: EA Centre for Christianity & Society*. Victoria, Australia: Ethos: EA Centre for Christianity & Society Publishers.
- Keener, C. S. (2005). *1-2 Corinthians New Cambridge Bible Commentary*. Cambridge . Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Khamadi, P. J. (2018, 12 05). *HTS/ Theological Studies: An analysis of conflict situations within the the leadership and various structures of the Dutch Reformed Church in Africa, Orange Free State*. Retrieved from [www.hts.org.za: https://www.hts.org.za/index.php/hts/article/view/4972/12253#5](https://www.hts.org.za/)
- Kieran, B. (2017, Aug 19). *Biblical Interpretaion – A Literal - Historical - Grmmatical Approach*. Retrieved from www.christianpublishinghouse.co:

<https://christianpublishinghouse.co/2017/08/19/biblical-interpretation-a-literal-historical-grammatical-approach/>

Klein, W. W. (1993). *Introduction to biblical Interpretation*. Dallas Texas, USA: Word Publishing House.

Kugel, J. L. (1999). *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge: Harvard University press.

Lanni, V. B. (2003). An Introduction to the Athenian Legal System. In A. Lanni, *Athenian Law in its Democratic Context (Center for Hellenic Studies On-line Discussion Series)*. Republished in C.W. Blackwell, ed. Athens: . The Stoa: a consortium for electronic publication in the humanities.

Liberata, G. (2015). The Contribution of the Memory in Healing and Preventing and preventing Genocide in Rwanda. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studie*, 109-118.

Lily, K. (2017, October 12). *Africa's "reverse missionaries" are bringing Christianity back to the United Kingdom*. Retrieved from www.qz.com:
<https://qz.com/africa/1088489/africas-reverse-missionaries-are-trying-to-bring-christianity-back-to-the-united-kingdom/>

MacArthur, J. (2001). *1 Corinthians: Godly Solutions for Church Problems*. Nashville, USA: Word Publishing Press.

MacArthur, J. (2020). *The MacArthur Bible Studies: 1 Corinthians Commentaries and Sermons*. Texas, USA: Thomas Nelson Press.

Maina, G. D. (2015). *Conflict in Pentecostal Churches: The case of Christian Church International, Murang'a County*. Nairobi, Kenya: Kinyata University Publishers.

Malcolm, M. R. (2016). The Structure and Theme of First Corinthians in Recent Scholarship. *Sage journals: Currents in Biblical Research*, 256–269.

Marshall, F. T. (1995). Mediation Quarterly. *Restorative justice on trial in Britain*, 217-231.

Marvin, V. R. (1997). *Word Studies in the New Testament: The Epistles of Paul*. New York, USA: Union Theological Seminary Press.

Masango, M. M. (2018). Understanding power struggles in the Pentecostal church government. . *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, e1 – e6.

Matt, S. (. (2017, 06 18). *The Truth About Unresolved church conflict*. Retrieved from www.bing.com:
https://www.bing.com/search?q=The+Truth+About+Unresolved+church+conflict+by+Matt%2C+S.+%282011%29.+&qsn&form=QBRE&msbrank=0_0__0&sp=-1&pq=the+truth+about+unresolved+church+conflict&sc=0-42&sk=&cvid=0CAE902BCEC84F2197F94AFAC145CF3B

Matthew, H. (2009). *Matthew Henry Commentary on the whole Bible*. England: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

- Mburu, E. (2019). *African Hermeneutics*. Cumbria, UK: Langham Publishing House.
- McCord, P. (2017). Toward a holistic vision of restorative juvenile justice: A reply to the maximalist model. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 3(4), 357-414.
- McCormack, K. C. (2014, 11 30). *Ethos, Pathos, and Logos: The Benefits of Aristotelian Rhetoric in the Courtroom*, 7 *Wash. U. Jur. Rev.* 131. Retrieved from openscholarship.wustl.edu: : https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_jurisprudence/vol7/iss1/9
- Michael, G. (1974). Arab-Israel Conflict: Where to from Here? *Australian Left Review*, 1(43), 19-25.
- Michael, G. J. (2001). *Elements of Biblical Exegesis: A Basic Guide for Students and Ministers*. . Peabody, Massachusetts, USA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Mohr., T. a. (1955). On the history of the interpretation of 1 Cor. 6:1-11 . *Die Auslegungsgeschichte*.
- Moneyman, C. (2004). "Establishing Collective Norms: Potentials for Participatory Justice in Rwanda." *Peace and Conflict*,. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1, 1-24.
- Muftic, L. E. (2015). *Victimology*. Georgia, USA: SAGE Publications.
- Oden, T. C. (2013). *1-2 Corinthians (Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture)*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge Publishing.
- Ololube, P. N. (2016). *The Handbook of Research on Organizational Justice and Culture in Higher Education Institutions*. Hersby, PA, USA: Information Science References - IGI global.
- P, S. (2018). *Restorative Justice: A Vision for healing and change*. Edmonton, Canada: Mediation and Restorative Center.
- Paul, S. J. (2018). *More Christians Now Live in Africa Than Any Other Continent in the World*. Washington DC, USA: Christian Post Press.
- Peter, K. J. (2019). How Religious Conflict Shapes State Repression. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. *SAGE Journals: Taming the Gods*, 112-138.
- Pheme, P. (2012). *Paideia Commentary on the New Testament, First Corinthians*. : . Michigan, USA: Baker Academic Publishing Group.
- Pillay, J. (2017). Pillay.J.Revival and unity of reformed churches: how to deal with this challenge? . In A. Boesk, *Reformed churches and theology*. Pretoria, South Africa: Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae.
- Pitts, S. P. (2013). *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*. Leiden, Boston: Brill Publishers.
- Poirier, A. (2006). *The peacemaking pastor: A biblical guide to resolving church conflict*. Michigan, USA: Baker Books.

- Pope, P. X. (1955, 09 14). *International Penal Law, Moral Limits of Medical Research*. Retrieved from www.christusliberat.org:
<https://christusliberat.org/journal/2018/11/15/pope-pius-xii-1952-the-moral-limits-of-medical-research-and-treatment/>
- PRC, P. R. (2010, 04 03). *Israel's Religiously Divided Society*. Retrieved from www.pewforum.org: [https://www.pewforum.org/2016/03/08/Israel's Religiously Divided Society](https://www.pewforum.org/2016/03/08/Israel's-Religiously-Divided-Society)
- PRI. (2007). *Monitoring and Research Report on the Gacaca*. London: Penal Reform International, United Kingdom.
- PRI, P. R. (2007). *Morning and Research Report on the Gacaca*. Brixton, London, UK: PRI - London Publishing.
- R, S. (2011, 07 01). *Christianity and the Law*. Retrieved from www.trueshare.com:
<http://www.trueshare.com/christianity/and/the/law/html>
- Randolph, E. (2012). *Pauline Prescripts and Greco-Roman epistolary conventions*. In *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture* . Michigan, USA: Christian tales press.
- Ravenhill, L. (2019, 11 15). *Quote from Goodreads*. Retrieved from www.goodreads.com:
<https://www.goodreads.com/quote/668244>
- Redford, L. (2015). Perceived Moral Responsibility for Attitude- Based Discrimination. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 55.
- Richardson, P. (1983). *Judgment In Sexual Matters in 1 Corinthians 6: 1-11*. Toronto, Canada: Brill.
- Roach, K. (2000). Changing punishment at the turn of the century: Restorative justice on the rise,. 4 CAN. J. CRIM. 249, , 249, 251, 253, 259, 275. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 249-275.
- Robson, J. (2015, April 1). The truth about sex in ancient Greece , 1-2. *The Conversation*, pp. 1-2.
- Roness, M. (2008). *Conflict and Conflict Management in Jewish Sources*. Rmat Gan, Israel: Ilan University Press.
- RoR, R. o. (2004, 04 November). *Genocide & Justice*. Kigali, Rwanda.
- Rosner. (1998). Temple Prostitution in 1 Corinthians 6:12-20. *Novum Testamentum* 40(4), 336-351.
- Sande, K. (1996). *The Peacemaker: A Biblical Guide to Resolving PErsonal Conflict*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker books Publishers.
- Schaff, P. (2002). *History of the Christian Church, Vol. II*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Schwarz, R. S. (2006). *Judaism and Justice. The Jewish passion to repair the world* . Jewish Lights.

- Sean, M. M. (2005). Competent to Judge: The Old Testament Connection Between 1 Corinthians 5 and 6 Volume 56, Issue 1. *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 99–102.
- Shalom, P. (2011, 07 21). *Justice in the Bible: How was justice managed in Biblical times?* Retrieved from [www.myjewishlearning.com: https://www.myjewishlearning.com/article/justice-in-the-bible/](http://www.myjewishlearning.com/article/justice-in-the-bible/)
- Sharpe, S. (2018). *Restorative Justice: A vision for healing and change*. Edmonton, Canada: Mediation and Restorative Justice Center.
- Shillington, G. (1986). People of God in the Courts of the World: A Study of 1 Corinthians 6:1-11. *Direction: A Mennonite Brethren Forum*, 40-50.
- Shmoop, T. (2008, November 11). *Corinthians Title*. Retrieved from [www.shmoop.com: http://www.shmoop.com/corinthians/title.html](http://www.shmoop.com/corinthians/title.html)
- Smith, K. G. (2008). *Academic Writing and Theological Research: A Guide for Students*. Johannesburg, South Africa: South African Theological Seminary Press.
- Stevens, R. (2019). *What is context and why is it important when studying a text?* <https://www.mytutor.co.uk/answers/14587/GCSE/English-Literature/What-is-context-and-why-is-it-important-when-studying-a-text-for-example-Romeo-and-Juliet/>, . Retrieved from www.mytutor.co.uk.
- Strong, G. (2019, 03 1). *Blue Letter Bible US*. Retrieved from [www.blueletterbible.org: https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?t=kjv&strongs=g1577](https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?t=kjv&strongs=g1577)
- Thiselton, A. C. (2000). *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Michigan, USA: Grand Rapids: Wm. B.Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Thomas, L. (2009). Peace Review . *A Journal of Social Justice. An Assessment of Rwanda's Gacaca Courts*, 304-312.
- Thomas, W. N. (2011 , 02 25). *Soulthoughts: N.T. Wright on judgment*. Retrieved from [www.soulthoughts.com: http://soulthoughts.com/n-t-wright-on-judgment/](http://soulthoughts.com/n-t-wright-on-judgment/)
- Timothy, L. (1999). Nation, Race or class? Defining the Hutu, and Tutsi of East africa. *In the Global Color Line: Racial and Ethnic Inequality and Struggle from a Global Perspective*, 103-130.
- Timothy, L. (2001). Journal of Religion in Africa . *Church Politics and the Genocide in Rwanda*, 163-186.
- Timothy, L. (2009). Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice . *An Assessment of Rwanda's Gacaca Courts*, 304-312.
- Tony, D. (2009). *Africa Leads the World in Growth of Christianity*. Orkney Springs, Virginia: Peace Evangelical Lutheran Church .
- Tyler. (2006). Restorative Justice and Procedural Justice: Dealing with Rule Breaking. *Journal of Social Issues*, 307-326.

- Umbrett, M. S. (1989). (1989). *Crime Victims Seeking Fairness, Not Revenge: Toward restorative justice*. Minesota, Canada: Centre for youth Development and Research.
- Uvin, P. (2003). Western and Local Approaches to Justice in Rwanda. *Global Governance*, 219-232.
- V, G. (2014). Über homiletische Killerparolen Oder die Chancen protestantischer Predigt heute. *Praktische Theologie*, Volume 32, Issue 3 , 179–202. *Index Theologicus: International Bibliography of Theology and Religious Studies*, 179-202.
- Vanhoozer. (2005). *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*. Cambridge, UK: Baker Publishing Group.
- W, C. C. (2018). *The role of parents in christian nurture* . Nairobi, Kenya: Evangel Publishing Company.
- Wallace, D. (1996). *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Michgan, USA: Zondervan Publishers.
- Walter. (2001). *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Wheaton, Illinois, USA: Baker Academic; 2 edition.
- Walvoord, J. F. (1986). *The Bible Knowledge Commentary*. . Wheaton Illinious, USA: : Victor Books Publishers.
- Warren. (1995). *The purpose driven church: Growth without compromising your*. Retrieved from www.studydrive.org: <https://www.studydrive.org/commentaries/dsb/1->
- Wayfairer. (2018, 04 01). *Global Spirituality Index: Ranking the World's Most Spiritual Countries by Wayfairer Travel*. Retrieved from www.wayfairertravel.com: <http://www.wayfairertravel.com/inspiration/globalspirituality-index/>
- Weem, R. D. (2013). *Transitions: Surviving Congregational Change* . Ynchburg, Virginia: Liberty University .
- Westacot. (2019, August 31). *Moral Philosophy According to Immanuel Kani* . Retrieved 06 10, 2020, . Retrieved from www.thoughtco.com: <https://thoughtco.com/kantian-ethics-moral-philosophy-kanti4045398>
- Winter, B. W. (2002). *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Leuven, Belgium: Pepperdine Digital Commons.
- Yi, O. C. (2016, July 1 9). *The Gacaca Courts: Traditional Dispute Resolution in Post-Genocide Rwanda* . Retrieved from www.ssrn.com: <http://www.ssrn.com/abstract=2679193> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2679193>
- Zehr, H. (2015). *The Little book of Restorative Justice*. Epsom, Surrey, England: Good Books Publisher.
- Zehr, H. (2017). *Fundamental Concepts of Restorative Justice*. Harrisonburg, Virginia: Eastern Menononite University.

Zuck, R. B. (1996). *Rightly divided: Readings in Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications.