

and mercy. We die in Christ, in the presence of God and in the company of our fellow-Christians. Our mother the Church stands with us in death as the mother of Jesus stood by the cross. This is the meaning of Viaticum and the Church's prayers for the dead.

263 *To what are we destined beyond death?*

All the faithful are destined beyond death to the resurrection, when the Kingdom of God will be finally established and we shall live our own real bodily lives, transfigured by the Spirit and, in Christ, share the Father's eternal life of understanding and joy. This is called heaven.

- Herbert McCabe OP : *The Teaching of the Catholic Church: a New Catechism of Christian Doctrine*. Catholic Truth Society, London, 1985. 80p.

## **Raised a Spiritual Body: bodily resurrection according to Paul**

Margaret Pamment

*Given at a seminar on 'The self in religion and philosophy'  
at Bristol University, 1984'*

The aim of this study is to understand what Paul means by his statement about the resurrection in I Corinthians 15:44: 'It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body'. We must examine Paul's use of the terms body (*soma*), physical (*psychikon* and *psyche*) and spiritual (*pneumatikon* and *pneuma*). One of the fullest recent expositions of Pauline usage is Robert Jewett's *Paul's Anthropological Terms* (Brill 1971), which criticises idealistic treatments of the subject and seeks definitions in particular historical settings. This is a sensible approach to the subject, since it allows for both development and contradiction, but it meets with the difficulties that we do not know for certain which of the epistles attributed to Paul are really Pauline; and we know neither in what circumstances

**372**

nor in which order they were written.

Most scholars agree with Jewett in judging Ephesians, Colossians and the Pastoral epistles to be Deutero-Pauline, and I shall not include references from them in my argument. I have not followed Jewett in attempting to define the development of Pauline thought in terms of an historical schema, but have noted related uses together, in order to show the range of particular kinds of usage more clearly.

Paul writes a great deal about man's past, present and future, and when doing so, he uses a variety of words besides *anthropos*. His anthropological vocabulary includes *soma*, *psyche*, *sarx*, *pneuma* and *nous*. By writing about man's life in different terms, is he intending to convey the view that part of man is really man and the rest contingent, for example, that his spirit is really man and his body and flesh are like clothes that can be discarded? Or is he using a part to stand for the whole (synecdoche: e.g. in English 'hands' for 'workers' or 'sailors'). We should be able to decide by examining his use of terms in context, and, in particular, by listing the predicates he attaches to each of them.

### I : *Pneuma and Pneumatikos*

(a) When Paul writes of a man's *pneuma*, he means that which determines a man's disposition or action. This is one of the many possible meanings of 'spirit' in English (e.g. 'it shows a good spirit') and is derived from the translation of Paul's writings. Paul asks Corinthian Christians:

'Shall I come to you with a rod, or with love in a *spirit* of gentleness?' (I Cor. 4:21 and see Gal. 6:1; II Cor. 12:8; Phil. 1:27)

Similarly, in quoting the O.T., Paul suggests that in the past, as in the present, most Israelites failed to attain what they sought (salvation) because 'God gave them a *spirit* of stupor' (Rm. 11:8).

On two occasions, the RSV translates *pneuma* by 'mind', but this is because 'mind' has a wide meaning in English, covering intellect, emotions and attitudes (e.g. 'frame of mind'). Paul uses the Greek word for 'mind' (*nous*) occasionally, but always in the narrow sense of 'reason' (e.g. I Cor. 1:10; 2:16; Rm. 7:23ff; 11:34) and in distinction from *pneuma* (e.g. I Cor. 14:14ff). The RSV translates *pneuma* in II Cor. 2:13.

'My *mind* could not rest because I did not find my brother Titus there.'

Paul does not imply that he was intellectually puzzled by Titus' absence, but that his spirit was disturbed. Similarly in II Cor. 7:13: Titus' '*spirit* had been set at rest' describes the way in which he was relieved at receiving a friendly welcome in Corinth.

When Paul tries to deal with the case of a Christian at Corinth who is living with his stepmother, he suggests that the Christian community should hold an assembly and throw out the man. He makes his own decision plain in the following statement:

‘For though absent in body, I am present *in spirit*, and as if present, I have already pronounced judgment in the name of the Lord Jesus on the man who has done such a thing.’  
(I Cor. 5:3 and see ‘my spirit’ in v.4).

There is no difficulty in seeing why Paul should say he is absent in body: he is not in Corinth. But why should he say that he is present in spirit? He does not say that he will give reasons in the letter for throwing out the man, so that they can be taken into account in the discussion at the assembly. He seems to think the matter is too clear-cut for that to be necessary. It is a case not of convincing reasons (he assumes them) but of appropriate action. By saying that he is present ‘in spirit’, is he suggesting that he is providing the Corinthians with a goad of action? In this case, he cannot say that he will come with a ‘spirit of judgement’ because he is not able to visit them immediately and he wants immediate action to be taken. His ‘spirit of judgement’ is made clear to them in the letter instead. In any case, the expression *hos paron* (RSV ‘as if present’) seems to indicate that he does not identify the presence of his spirit with his presence in person.<sup>2</sup>

On several occasions, Paul links together a number of anthropological terms to describe the whole person. In Cor. 7:34 he refers to ‘body and spirit’ (*soma* and *pneuma*). The statement forms part of a discussion on the difficulties of married life, and Paul suggests that unmarried men and women can be completely dedicated to Christ’s service in a way that married people cannot. He writes:

‘The unmarried woman or girl is anxious about the affairs of the Lord, how to be holy in body and *spirit*.’

This is parallel to the saying in v. 32:

‘The unmarried man is anxious about the affairs of the Lord, how to please the Lord.’

Paul writes about dedication again in II Cor. 7:1. The change from *soma* to *sarx* (which has more negative connotations) is explained by the change from *dedication* of the body to cleansing from *defilement* of the flesh. In I Thessalonians 5:23, again dedication is the theme. It is difficult to see what *psyche* adds to spirit and body except perhaps the notion of liveliness. In the summary conclusion to the epistle, Paul is re-emphasizing that it is the whole person who is to be kept sound and blameless as in I Thessalonians 4:1ff.

In two places in Romans, Paul makes a distinction between ‘the letter’ and ‘the spirit’. In relation to circumcision (Rm. 2:29) and in relation to the law (Rm. 7:6. Here however ‘spirit’ may mean ‘spirit of God’).<sup>3</sup> This helps to make sense of Paul’s statement in Romans 1:9

where Paul does not write 'whom I serve' but 'whom I serve *with my spirit*' to emphasise the completeness and reality of his service. For the same reason, Paul ends some of his letters:

'The grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ be *with your spirit*, brethren.' (Gal. 6:18; Phil. 4:23; Philemon 25; II Tim. 4:22; compare 'with you' in Rm. 16:20; 1 Thess. 5:28; and 'with you all' in II Cor. 13:14; II Thess. 3:18; Titus 3:15)<sup>4</sup>

In none of these examples does Paul suggest that a man's spirit is separable from the rest of him, as his real and permanent self. Even in I Cor. 5:3, we saw reason to think that what was present was not Paul himself but his decisiveness. Paul uses *pneuma* to draw attention to an aspect of man's life. The predicates used are as follows:

A man's spirit can be disturbed,  
...can be dedicated to God or Christ, but only with his body.  
.....can make outward observance into real observance.

There are, however, two examples which I have not yet mentioned, but which do not fit easily with those discussed so far. In I Cor. 5:5 (back to the man who is living with his stepmother) Paul writes:

'You are to deliver this man to Satan for the destruction of his flesh, that *his spirit* may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.'

Does this imply that man is made of two elements, one of which can be discarded like clothes (flesh), while the other remains (spirit)? The first part of the sentence seems to mean: the man is to be handed over to Satan i.e. thrown out of the church, the realm of Christ, into the world, the realm of Satan, and the purpose of this exercise (*eis* indicating purpose) is to destroy his flesh etc. Paul sometimes uses 'flesh' in a neutral sense, to mean what an animal, including man, is made of, e.g. in I Cor. 15:39, or to mean man's natural propensities without God's help e.g. I Cor. 1:26; Rm. 3:20. In this way, however, 'flesh' is associated with man's weakness and vulnerability (e.g. II Cor. 10:2—4) because Paul thinks that man left to himself without God is corruptible and destined to die, and death is the punishment for sin. Sin and flesh are therefore associated, and both with death: 'While we are living in the flesh, our sinful passions, aroused by the law, were at work in our members to bear fruit for death' (Rm: 7:5) and 'We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal (*sarkinos*), sold under sin' (Rm. 7:14).<sup>5</sup> It is therefore possible that I Cor. 5:5 means by 'flesh' either 'What a man is made of' or 'his sinful orientation'. If the former is accepted, this means that *pneuma* is man's real self and that it can exist in isolation from the flesh. But if 'flesh' stands for man's sinful orientation, then 'spirit' means his orientation to God. Here, and in the next example, I suggest that Paul's vocabulary is influenced by his use of the phrases *kata sarka* and *kata pneuma* which I shall

look at in a moment, but first let me cite the second example. Rm. 8:10: 'And if Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin, and *the spirit* is life because of righteousness.'

Does this imply that man's body is only contingently linked with man's real self: his spirit? Paul's parallel statement in the next verse shows that this cannot be the meaning:

'If *the spirit* of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through *his spirit* that dwells in you.'

8:10 is therefore making a distinction between the mortality of the body of a sinner and the life which God's spirit brings to that body.<sup>6</sup>

(b) I have been concentrating on Paul's use of *pneuma* as an anthropological term, but he also uses *pneuma* as a theological term (as I have twice hinted, in Rm. 7:6 and 8:10). Paul believes that man need not be left to his own devices in this world, but that the God who creates the world is also active in the lives of men through his spirit, effecting a re-orientation from self-sufficiency to an acceptance of what God gives, eternal life: e.g. Rm. 8:2; Gal. 6:8; Gal. 3:2ff.

The spirit in this sense is God's spirit or Jesus' spirit or the Holy Spirit e.g. Rm. 8:9ff; Gal. 4:6; 5:5.<sup>7</sup> The central role of the spirit is to reveal God in Jesus' life, death and resurrection. This revelation is contrasted with worldly self-seeking wisdom: I Cor. 2:4 (and see I Thess. 1:5). Paul must be using the word 'power' ironically because he is talking about Jesus' crucifixion, an event which demonstrates powerlessness by worldly standards and which is regarded as an act of foolishness by worldly men (I Cor. 1:18ff). Recognising the significance of the cross means accepting the revelation effected by the Spirit. This revelation brings about new life in believers (I Cor. 6:11, and whatever else I Cor. 15:45 means, it seems to involve this) so that Christians collectively are seen as the Temple of God's Spirit (I Cor. 3:16). Paul makes judgements about practical issues (e.g. marriage and celibacy) on this basis (I Cor. 7:40).

However, Paul does not identify the possession of God's spirit now with complete salvation. He writes that the spirit brings freedom (II Cor. 3:17–18) and sonship (Rm. 8:15) but there is tension between promise and realisation (see Rm. 15:13). The spirit brings a guarantee that men can look forward to eternal life when the final judgement arrives (II Cor. 1:22 and see 5:5). Possession of the spirit gives ground for hope (Rm. 8:23f.).

(c) Since Paul sees Christians as Temples of God's spirit, he expects their lives to express divine inspiration (II Cor. 3:3 and see v. 6). The Christian's life is meant to reflect the life of God (Rm. 5:5 and see

15:30). Paul's ethical teaching is therefore couched in terms of an either/or: a man's life can be centred in self-assertion or centred in God through the Spirit of God dwelling in him: he can 'walk according to the flesh' or 'walk according to the Spirit', (e.g. Rm. 8:5f).<sup>8</sup> The opposition 'according to (or in) the flesh' and 'according to the Spirit' is not a contrast between physical and mental, since Roman Christians living a normal bodily existence are nevertheless 'not in the flesh but in the Spirit'. According to Paul, this opposition has always existed in the world (Gal. 4:29 and see Rm. 1:4). Paul spells out what is involved in these two contrary orientations in Gal. 5:16ff, which is not a list of sensual indulgences, but a list of self-indulgences.

V. 22 continues:

'But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control.

This is a list of dispositions, ending with the opposite of self-indulgence, self-control. Paul seems to think that God's spirit effectively alters man's spirit in an unselfish direction (similarly Rm. 8:15).

The opposition *kata sarka/kata pneuma* throws light on Paul's discussion about going to prostitutes (I Cor. 6:17). Paul writes (v. 16a) that whoever sleeps with a prostitute becomes 'one body' with her, using language akin to that in Rm. 12:3 about the church as one body in Christ i.e. he is referring not to the individual body but to the body corporate. Had he pursued this argument, he might have said that Christians who become 'one body' with a prostitute must live out their corporate union i.e. continue to live as man and wife would. However, in quoting Genesis 3:24 (Septuagint) in support of his argument he introduces a different word: 'one flesh' instead 'one body' (v. 16b). This is useful because 'flesh' has connotations that 'body' does not have, and fornication is a 'work of the flesh', making the Christian and the prostitute unite in opposition to God. In contrast to this, Paul asserts: 'But he who is united with the Lord is *one spirit*', in other words, a Christian's disposition is no longer an expression of selfishness, but is an expression of God's love, which is incompatible with making use of a prostitute.<sup>9</sup> IN I Cor. 6:17, and in the two examples which seemed to fit uneasily with Paul's usual use of *pneuma* as an anthropological term (I Cor. 5:5 and Rm. 8:10), Paul is using *sarx* and *pneuma* as shorthand for *kata sarka* and *kata pneuma*.

(d) A man who is living *kata pneuma* is described by Paul as *pneumatikos*:

'Brethren, if a man is overtaken by an trespass, you who are *spiritual* should restore him.' (Gal. 6:1)

Because the Corinthian Christians are split by dissensions, Paul refuses to call them *pneumatikoi* (I Cor. 3:1. but see also 2:13 and 15;

and 14:37). But the adjective can be used not only of men but also of gifts given by God e.g. the law (Rm. 7:14), the Gospel (Rm. 15:27; I Cor. 9:11), the miraculous manna and water in the wilderness (I Cor. 10:3–4), and the special talents of preaching, teaching, healing, and helping that Paul also calls *charismata* (I Cor. 12:1 and 14:1 and see Rm. 1:11).

Finally, when discussing the resurrection, Paul contrasts the *soma psychikon* with the *soma pneumatikon* (I Cor. 15:44 and 46). We have now defined what *pneumatikon* means: a *soma pneumatikon* is a body enlivened by God's spirit, no longer dedicated to self-indulgence but to God.

## II : *Psyche and psychikon*

In I Cor. 15:44, Paul contrasts *soma psychikon* with *soma pneumatikon*. What do *psyche* and *psychikon* mean? Perhaps the term *psychikon* was suggested to Paul by his use of the quotation in the following verse (15:45) about Adam as *eis psychen zosan* (Genesis 2:7) 'a living being'. Otherwise, would he have chosen the opposites he uses more frequently: *sarkikos/pneumatikos*? I think the answer is no. The *sarkikon* has to die and is not raised.<sup>10</sup> Paul needs a more neutral term, without the negative connotations of *sarx*, to stand for the natural man, created by God, like the first Adam. *Sarx* emphasises man's frailty, but *psyche*, because of its associations with 'breath', emphasises man's liveliness.<sup>11</sup> In many instances, *psyche* is appropriately translated 'life' (Rm. 2:9; II:3; 16:4; II Cor. 1:23; 12:15; Phil. 2:30; I Thess. 2:8)<sup>12</sup> In Rm. 13:1 'human being' is probably a better translation. The RSV translates Phil. 1:27: 'with one mind' but the translation:

'I may hear of you that you stand firm, one in spirit, striving side by side for the faith of the Gospel, *one in life*' is clearer.<sup>13</sup> Both in I Cor. 15:44ff and in I Cor. 2:14 *psyche* and *psychikon* is the natural living man, created by God, but without God's spirit. The natural living man is the prerequisite of the spiritual man (I Cor. 15:46).<sup>14</sup>

## III : *Soma*

Why does Paul use *soma* with two distinguishing adjectives (*psychikon* and *pneumatikon*) in I Cor. 15:44 instead of using *psyche* and *pneuma*? First we must examine what he means by *soma*. This word is used more frequently in I Corinthians than in any other Pauline epistle, and it is used in a variety of contexts, anthropological, eucharistic and ecclesiological.

Paul often writes about the body being dedicated to Christ or to

God: I Cor. 6:13ff; 7:34 discussed above, Rm. 12:1; Phil. 1:20; I Thess. 5:23. Why does Paul use 'body' in these statements? Perhaps because he is seeking to combat in his readers a tendency to think of dedication in terms of a man's spirit separated from his body.

On two occasions, Paul describes his actual presence or absence as a bodily presence or absence: I Cor. 5:3, discussed above, and II Cor. 10:10. These references use *soma* to emphasise the reality of a person's presence. Perhaps this usage throws light on Paul's discussion of the eucharist in I Cor. 11:17–34. He criticises the Corinthians for turning the Lord's Supper into their own supper by their factious and selfish behaviour (v. 18–22). He reminds them of Jesus' words, which include this statement over the blessed and broken bread: 'This is *my body*' (v.24). In continuing his criticism of Corinthian behaviour, he picks up this statement, v.29:

'For anyone who eats and drinks without discerning the *body* eats and drinks judgement on himself.'

It is tempting to interpret 'body' in a corporate sense: the Corinthians eat and drink without recognising their unity in Christ and therefore behave without concern for one another (Congelmann advocates such an interpretation), but if this is Paul's meaning, we would expect him to go on to encourage those who had plenty to share with those who had little, which he does not do (see v.33f). Rather, 'body' in v.29 means Christ's presence.

Often, Paul uses 'body' in contexts which are concerned with man's physical nature, e.g. in comparing the Christian life with that of an athlete (I Cor. 9:26f and see I Cor. 13:13). A body is a material entity with parts (Rm. 6:12f.). The members of the body are eyes, ears, hands, etc. (see I Cor. 12:12ff). Further, a body is a natural entity, not a construct, and the term can be used not only of man and animals but also of plants, sun, moon and stars (I Cor. 15:40). In Paul's letters, 'bodies' are always alive and he prefers *oi nekroi* for 'the dead' (e.g. I Cor. 15:35), although *soma* is used for 'corpse' in the Septuagint and Hellenistic literature. Perhaps I Cor. 7:3f should be included here because sexual relations are the subject. Galatians 6:17 could also belong here, if it is taken as parallel to Jewish circumcision, but it seems more likely that it is parallel to 'the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom the world has been crucified to me and I to the world' (6:14) and 'in my body' has a wider meaning than a simple reference to physical marks would imply, i.e. a meaning nearer to the English 'somebody', 'anybody'. It is tempting to include Rm. 1:24 too, but again 'body' seems to have a wider meaning because it is idolatry that dishonours men's bodies.<sup>15</sup>

Most of the references to 'body' in an anthropological sense are associated in Paul's letters with death: Rm. 4:19, 6:12. Rm. 6:12 is an exhortation which follows on from Paul's teachings about baptism as



dying with Christ in order to be raised with him in the future: Rm. 6:6ff.<sup>16</sup> This association is explained more fully in Romans 7 and 8. Romans 7 ends with the question:

‘Who will deliver me *from this body of death*?’ (Rm. 7:24)<sup>17</sup>

A presupposition of Paul’s thinking is that death is the punishment for sin, a view based on an interpretation of Genesis 3. Man’s sin in turning from God, the source of his life, to himself, to a self-sufficiency without God, results in the loss of life which God gives, e.g. Rm. 5:12; 6:23; 8:2.<sup>18</sup> Paul often moves between death as a physical fact and death as a metaphor for the destruction of selfishness (e.g. in Rm. 6). In chapter 8, too, both physical and metaphorical death are present.

‘But if Christ is in you, although *the body* is dead because of sin, the spirit is life because of righteousness’ (see the discussion of this verse above). ‘If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to *your mortal bodies* through his spirit which dwells in you ... For if you live according to the flesh you will die, but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body you will live.’ (8:10ff).

Does this imply that salvation is something which involves man’s spirit but not his body? No, it involves the death of the mortal body, both metaphorically and physically, but the resurrection of the body no longer either dead to sin or mortal. C.E.B. Cranfield (I.C.C. on *Romans* 1975) points out that in ‘the deeds (*praxeis*) of the body’ *praxeis* can have the pejorative sense of intrigues and treacheries i.e. ‘bad deeds of the body’. Paul makes his meaning clear by contrasting one body with another in Philippians 3:21:

‘The Lord Jesus Christ who will change our lowly body (literally: the body of humiliation) to be like his glorious body (literally: the body of his glory). (See also Phil. 3:10 and Rm. 8:23)

Some intimation of this final redemption is however present now: II Cor. 4:10. For Paul, a man’s body is mortal because he is a sinner, because sin has found opportunity in man’s frailty, his flesh (Rm. 7:5) and separated him from the God who creates life. His body is material and the material of his present body is flesh which is corruptible. Here Paul is thinking not of quasi-independent operations of nature but of God giving life and man rejecting the gift. The death of the flesh (both metaphorical and physical) is the end of sin, but it is not necessarily the end of the body. So ‘flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable’ (I Cor. 15:50) but the body does inherit the kingdom of God when it is transformed, presumably materially transformed, by the Spirit of

God (Rm. 8). The body transformed by the Spirit of God is not a body of flesh but a body of glory. Of course, Paul is not very specific about the nature of a body of glory, which he defines with a series of opposites: perishable/imperishable, dishonour/glory, weakness/power, natural living/spiritual (I Cor. 15:42ff). In I Cor. 13 the only Christian experience said to be common to the church's present existence and to the future kingdom is love (*agape*).

It is because the body can be mortal but can be redeemed that in I Cor. 15:44–46 Paul contrasts not *psyche* and *pneuma* but *soma psychikon* and *soma pneumatikon*.

One instance I have not yet considered seems to give substance to the suggestion that a man can exist without a body, however:

'I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven—whether *in the body* or *out of the body* (*en somati, ekτος του somatos*) I do not know, God knows. And I know that this same man was caught up into Paradise—whether *in the body* or *without the body* (*en somati, choris του somatos*) I do not know, God knows—and he heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter.' (II Cor. 12:2ff.)

Paul introduces this strange statement about an experience he had fourteen years earlier:

'I will go on to visions and revelations of the Lord.' (II Cor. 12.1).

He is describing an ecstatic experience as a journey to one of the heavens, somewhat in the manner of Jewish apocalyptic writers (e.g. I Enoch, and see Revelation 12:5). But what does 'in the body/out of or without the body' mean? Perhaps Paul is wondering whether the experience was a dream or reality, but such an interpretation is without parallel in Paul and implies that he took the metaphorical language of the journey literally, which is unlikely.<sup>19, 20</sup>

Most commentators seem to suppose that Paul's language in II Cor. 12:2ff is akin to that of Plato in the *Phaedo*, in which expression *choris του somatos* occurs in connexion with knowledge (67a).

'For if pure knowledge is impossible while the body is with us, one of two things must follow: either it cannot be acquired at all or only when we are dead; for then the soul will be by itself, *apart from the body*, but not before. And while we live, we shall I think, be nearest to knowledge when we avoid, so far as possible, intercourse or communion with the body, except what is absolutely necessary, and are not filled with its nature, but keep ourselves pure from it until God himself sets us free.'

(Translation from Loeb.)

Socrates then goes on to advise philosophers to practise dying as

separation from the body. Paul makes it clear that he does not share this view. He believes that life in the Kingdom of God will bring with it full instead of partial knowledge (I Cor. 13:12), but he also believes that life in the kingdom will be bodily, and therefore does not advise his readers to practise living apart from the body, but recommends that they dedicate the body to God.<sup>21</sup>

I wonder whether the expressions *choris tou somatos* and *ektos tou somatos* in II Cor. 12:2ff mean something like the English 'he was beside himself' in contrast to 'he was fully himself'. There is no direct evidence that this is so, but a little indirect evidence that makes it possible. An alternative way of expressing this idea in Greek is to use the verb: *existemi*. Earlier in II Corinthians, in a section which is concerned with Paul's sufferings and the relation of his suffering to his status as apostle i.e. in a context similar to that of II Cor. 12:2ff, Paul states:

'For if we are beside ourselves (*exestemen*) it is for God; if we are in our right mind, it is for you.' (II Cor. 5:13).

This is the main reason for seeing a similar meaning in II Cor. 12:2ff. Otherwise, Hippocrates (*Epidemics* 7:90) uses the expression *ektos heotes* (Ionic for *heoutes*) for 'beside herself', 'out of her wits', and Philo *ektos heautou* about confession which takes a man out of himself (*Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis* 2, 1, 82).<sup>22</sup> These details provide nothing more than pointers that Paul's meaning in II Cor. 12:2ff could be: 'whether fully himself or beside himself'. The advantage of such an interpretation is that it makes unnecessary a Platonic or Philonic reading which fails to fit with Paul's teaching about the body in the rest of his writings.

Now to draw the material together. The adjectival expressions Paul uses with *soma* are as follows:

- A heavenly body (e.g. sun, moon, stars)
- An earthly body (e.g. plants, animals, birds, fish, man)
- A body of humility
- A body of weakness
- A body of sin
- A mortal body
- A perishable body
- A body of death (Paul does not use 'dead body' for 'corpse' but *hoi nekroi* e.g. I Cor. 15:12ff)
- A dishonourable body
- A natural living body
- A body of power
- A spiritual body
- An imperishable body
- A body of glory.

The predicates he uses with 'body' are as follows:

A body has many parts (e.g. hand, eye, ear, etc.)

A body may be present or absent (meaning the presence or absence of the person as in Scottish usage.)

(An ecstatic may be out of/without a body which seems to mean either that he is dreaming or that he is 'beside himself')

A body may be pommelled

A body may be burned

A body may be ruled over by husband/wife

A body may be dishonoured by idolatry

A body may be destroyed

A body may die metaphorically

A body may die

A body may bear (either literally or metaphorically) the marks of Jesus.

A body may be dedicated to God (either simply a body, or a body with a spirit or with a soul and a spirit)

A body may manifest the life of Jesus

A body may be redeemed

A body may be made alive by God

It seems that Paul thinks man cannot continue to exist without a body. He does not *have* a body but he *is* a body. But does the body express personal continuity? When Paul uses the terms *soma psychikon* and *soma pneumatikon*, is he expressing personal continuity with the term *soma* and change with the terms *psychikon* and *pneumatikon*? Or does he envisage two different bodies? At the beginning of the section (I Cor. 15:37), when Paul introduces the analogy of the seed dying and producing a plant, he says:

What you sow is not *the body that is to be*, but a bare kernel, perhaps of wheat or of some other grain. But God gives it *a body* as he has chosen, and to each kind of seed *its own body*.'

The meaning of this statement is not completely clear. Is the seed's body different from the plant's body or is there only a difference in form as bodily promise is realised? V. 38 suggests the latter, and this seems to be confirmed by v.44 and v.46. The same body is natural and becomes spiritual.<sup>23</sup> However, what has been said about the meaning of *pneumatikos* shows that this is not simply a matter of natural potential being actualised, but of natural promise being taken over by the divine spirit. Even in the case of plants, Paul thinks of God's creative activity bringing about the change from seed to plant (v.38) rather than of the operation of a quasi-independent nature. Paul, then, seems to think that bodily continuity expresses personal continuity, although there will also be transformation. Hence, those

who are still alive at the end of the world will be changed from mortal to immortal bodily existence (I Cor. 15:52ff and I Thess. 4:17).

However, Professor Moule has suggested<sup>24</sup> that in II Cor. 5:1ff, Paul means that at the resurrection matter will finally be surrendered and released in exchange for that which transcends it: God demands not addition but exchange. Moule argues that I Cor. 15 looks forward to the Parousia for those still living, so that addition and transformation are appropriate, whereas II Cor. 5 sees death intervening and here it is appropriate to talk about losing something first. I think this distinction is incorrect. In I Cor. 15, Paul is writing both about the dead being raised (see v.29 and v.35ff) and about the transformation of those who will not die before Christ's return (v.51ff).

II Cor. 5 mixes metaphorical language about buildings with metaphorical language about clothing:

'For we know that if this earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens' (5:1).

This draws out what was said in 4:16f:

'Though our outer nature (*ho exo hemon anthropos*) is wasting away, our inner nature (*ho eso*) is being renewed every day. For this slight momentary affliction' (i.e. the persecution Paul and his companions suffer. See 4:8ff) 'is preparing for us an eternal weight of glory beyond all comparison.'

II Cor. 5:2 continues

'Here indeed we groan and long to put on our heavenly dwelling, so that by putting it on we may not be found naked. For while we are still in the tent, we sigh with anxiety: not that we want to be unclothed but that we want to be further clothed, so that what is mortal may be swallowed up' (*katapothē* from *katapino*: the language seems to come from Isaiah 25:8 which is quoted in I Cor. 15:54) 'by life. He who has prepared us for this very thing is God who has given us the Spirit as a guarantee.'

It is difficult to know how far to press the metaphors, but Paul seems to be saying much the same as in Romans 8:18ff: present suffering is not to be compared with future glory. When he writes that he does not want to be found naked and that he does not want to be unclothed but rather clothed further, he means that he does not want to die without hope of resurrection presumably through faithlessness, and hence the anxiety when under the strain of persecution.<sup>25</sup> The spirit guarantees that death will not be the last word.<sup>26</sup> Paul continues by introducing the word 'body' into the discussion for the first time in v.6ff:

'So we are always of good courage; we know that while we

are *at home in the body* we are away from the Lord, for we walk by faith and not by sight. We are of good courage, and we would rather be *away from the body* and at home with the Lord. So whether we are at home or away, we make it our aim to please him. For we must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ, so that each one may receive good or evil, according to what he accomplished *through the body.*'

In this section, 'body' replaces 'tent' of v.1—5 and describes Paul's present existence, suffering persecution. He does not use a single word to replace 'heavenly dwelling' from v. 1—5, but the clause 'to be at home with the Lord'. What are we to gather from the contraries 'to be at home in the body' and 'to be at home with the Lord'? Paul here uses 'body' in the sense which he usually defines more exactly as 'mortal body', although he uses 'body' alone in Philippians 1:20 in a similar context. Had he used the fuller expression, perhaps the contrary 'body of glory' would have come to mind. It would, I think, place too much weight on the passage to suggest that it contradicts I Cor. 15:44ff in supposing that only present existence is bodily and future existence, whether before or after the resurrection, without a body.<sup>27</sup>

To return to I Cor. 15:44. Is the Pauline expression: 'It is sown a natural living body, it is raised a spiritual body' adequate in expressing personal continuity between present existence and post-mortem existence? Can 'body' be used sensibly to express personal continuity? 'Body' can be used sensibly to express individuality since it is a natural entity, and it is possible to see how the person who is alive at the end of the world might be changed from a natural living body into a spiritual body while remaining the same person (the silk sock darned with wool remains the same sock).<sup>28</sup> But death involves the destruction of the body, and if death intervenes, how can it be claimed that the person who is raised is the same as the person who dies? Presumably, Paul believes that the post-mortem body is sufficiently similar to the pre-mortem body for it to be recognisable as a version of the natural living body by the individual and others, but since memory is insufficient to guarantee identity, this does not solve the problem.<sup>29</sup> What seems to be required is some kind of continuity between the natural living body and the spiritual body, and traditional Christian theology has found this is the continuing existence of the disembodied soul. Some scholars have interpreted Philippians 1:23 and I Cor. 5:6ff to mean that Paul believed in the continuing existence of a disembodied soul before the resurrection<sup>30</sup> but this seems to me to be very doubtful. Had he done so, he would surely have explained his view more clearly either in I Cor. 15, or in Phil. 1:23 and II Cor. 5:6ff if these passages are understood as a development of ideas expressed

in I Cor. 15

Can Paul's teaching about community help him out of this difficulty?

#### IV : *The Body Corporate*

Paul uses 'body' in a metaphorical sense to mean 'aggregation of persons'. In I Cor 6:16 he states that having sexual intercourse with a person, even if that person is a prostitute, makes the two 'one body'. It is presumably the same metaphor that lies behind his statement in the next chapter: I Cor. 7:14. The family is a small aggregate of persons which can be called, metaphorically, a body.

Paul has more to say about a larger aggregate of persons, the church, whom he calls 'the body of Christ': I Cor. 12:12ff. In this passage, Paul stresses the mutual dependence of individual Christians, who are urged: 'Strive to excel in building up the church' (I Cor. 14:12,26). In Romans 12:3ff, similar language ('We being many are *one body in Christ*') is used to discourage people from thinking of themselves more highly than they ought to think.<sup>31</sup> Perhaps Paul derived the identification 'the body of Christ' in I Corinthians from Jewish speculations about the body of Adam, as Jewett suggests (p. 272f). In identifying 'the body' as 'the body of Christ' he goes beyond ordinary metaphorical usage, which focuses attention on the community, to focus attention on Christ. Probably Paul was drawn to this development for two reasons: firstly, to offset the individualism of the language about being 'in Christ'<sup>32</sup> and secondly, to draw out the implications of the Eucharist: I Cor. 10:16ff. Nevertheless, Paul does not think that Christ has no existence apart from the church since Christ existed before the Church. Rather, believers' incorporation into Christ means that believers share Christ's biography (e.g. die with him in order that they may be raised with him, Romans 6) and so effect Christ's presence in the world, but not to the exclusion of Christ's independent presence. If the church ceased to exist, Christ would not cease to exist, i.e. this is a case of specific, but not numerical, identity.

It appears then, that Paul's teaching about believers as members of Christ's body fails to supply the continuity required between the individual believer who dies and the individual believer who is raised. Perhaps Paul assumed a 'physicalist' view: that the original atoms of the natural body link pre- and post-mortem existence. He does not express such a view clearly (e.g. in I Thess. 4:13ff or in I Cor. 15 where it could have been voiced) but this may be because he took it for granted. Some forms of contemporary Judaism seem to have regarded the continuing existence of a persons bones as crucially important.<sup>33</sup> If Paul did accept this view, which was less difficult for him than for us

because of his understanding of physics and because he believed the world would shortly come to an end, it is one which we cannot accept today.

- 1 The seminar centred on John Locke's development of Cartesian dualism. Locke himself wrote notes on Pauline epistles (Works of John Locke, vol. III London 1823). Unfortunately, such modern New Testament scholarship unselfconsciously adopts Locke's dualism without realising how far removed it is from the presuppositions of New Testament writers.
- 2 See M.E. Boring's discussion of this passage in terms of Paul's prophetic status. *Sayings of the Risen Lord* C.U.P. 1982.
- 3 See below and II Cor. 3:6
- 4 Robert Jewett ignores some of these references, and his attempt to identify the spirit as divine rather than human in others is unsatisfactory: *Paul's Anthropological Terms* Brill 1971 p. 183ff. He admits that Romans 8:16 makes a clear distinction between human spirit and divine spirit but thinks this is a late development. Occasionally, his expositions seem convoluted e.g. I Cor. 5:3—5 on p. 189ff, but this is admittedly a different example.
- 5 See Robert Jewett's discussion of these passages, p.97ff.
- 6 Notice that 8:10 reads: 'The spirit is life' and not, as the RSV misleadingly translates 'your spirit is alive.'
- 7 On Rm. 14:17 see the discussion in C.E.B. Cranfield, I.C.C. on *Romans*, 1979, p. 840ff.
- 8 Here Paul makes no distinction between 'Walking according to the flesh' and 'living in the flesh'. Elsewhere, he found it useful to make such a distinction: see II Cor. 10:2—4 and Gal. 2:20.
- 9 In I Cor. 12:13, Paul expresses the unity of the spirit more fully.
- 10 Contra Jewett p. 354, who has to admit that the use he supposes Paul makes of Gnostic terminology is found nowhere else in Paul's epistles.
- 11 In Homer and Aristotle it stands for the 'vital principle': for a recent discussion see A.W.H. Adkins: *From the Many to the One*. London 1970.
- 12 In Phillipians, 3 cognates of *psyche* also occur: *synpsychoi* in 2:2 which RSV translates as 'being in full accord', *eupsycheo* in 2:19 which the NEB translates 'to cheer'; and *isopsycho* in 2:20 which J.L. Houlden argues should be translated: 'I have no one so like myself in my interests' in *Paul's Letters from Prison* Pelican 1970.
- 13 Similarly, the RSV's translation of *ek psyches* as 'heartily' in Col. 3:23 and Eph. 6:6 is better translated 'in a lively manner'.
- 14 Paul uses *psyche/psychikon* in contexts which describe human beings and not animals. The word was used of animals in classical Greek and in the LXX (Gen. 1:30; Lev. 17:11), although it was also used in senses which excluded application to animals. There is no reason in principle why Paul should not have used the term of animals had the subject come up, unless Romans 13:1 is taken to exclude this possibility.
- 15 See the discussion by C.E.B. Cranfield, *I.C.C. Romans* Vol. 1 1975.
- 16 See Romans 7:4 and Jewett's discussion p. 299f.
- 17 Jewett unsatisfactorily writes off this question as a Gnostic lamentation which Paul used, p. 294.
- 18 This is not sufficiently integrated into his exposition by Jewett on *sarx* in Romans 7—8, p. 145ff.
- 19 But cf. Josephus *War VII* 349.
- 20 In comparing fornication with other sins in I Cor. 6:18, Paul describes fornicating as 'sinning against one's own body' whereas other sins are 'outside



- the body' (*ektos tou somatos*). What does this mean since sins like gluttony and drunkenness, mentioned by Paul in this context (I Cor. 6:10) seem against one's own body? Does Paul understand gluttony and drunkenness as sins against one's flesh but not against one's body? This seems to be implied by the contrast between food and sex in 6:12ff. In any case *ektos tou somatos* in this context does not help to illuminate its use in II Cor. 12:2ff.
- 21 Philo's use of the term *asomatos* is similarly far from Pauline usage e.g. *On the Cherubim* 14, *Questions on Exodus* II, 51, *Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis* 2 III 41, *On Dreams* I 36, *The Worse attacks the Better* 159, *On the Giants* 14 and 31, *Noah's Work as a Planter* 14.
- 22 In the Septuagint version of Nehemiah 9:26 and Ezekiel 23:35, the expression *opiso tou somatos* is used:  
 'Nevertheless, they were disobedient and rebelled against you, and cast your law *behind your back* and killed your prophets.' (Neh. 9:26)  
 'Because you have forgotten me (the Lord God) and cast me *behind your back*, therefore bear the consequences of your lewdness and harlotry.' (Ezek. 23:35).
- 23 Contra Robert Jewett p. 267f and Conzelmann in his commentary.
- 24 St. Paul and Dualism in *Essays in N.T. Interpretation* CUP 1982.
- 25 See e.g. A. Oepke in *TWNT* on *gymnos*, *ekduo*, *parousia* and cf. I Cor. 15:53ff.
- 26 For a different view see the long discussion and references in C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on II Corinthians*, Black 1973.
- 27 Contra Robert Jewett's interpretation, p. 274ff in which he thinks Paul is using Gnostic terminology, and see the references and discussion by A.T. Lincoln *Paradise Now and Not Yet* CUP 1981 p. 55ff.
- 28 See P. Geach *God and the Soul*. R.K.P. 1969, p. 27.
- 29 See B. Williams *Problems of the Self*. C.U.P. 1973.
- 30 e.g. A.T. Lincoln *Paradise Now and Not Yet*. CUP 1981 p. 55ff.
- 31 Similar teaching is used extensively in the Deutero-Pauline epistles, Ephesians and Colossians.
- 32 Unless 'in Christ' is derived from 'the body of Christ' as Albert Schweitzer suggested: *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* E.T. London 1931.p. 122f.
- 33 On the basis of passages like Genesis 50:25; Exodus 13:19; I Sam. 31:13; II Kings 23:18; Amos 2:1 or Ezekiel 37.