The holy spirit in 1 Corinthians

Watkins, P. L.

ABSTRACT

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN 1 CORINTHIANS

P. L. WATKINS

When Paul wrote his First Letter to the Corinthians he did so as their father in Christ, continuing his founding mission through his letter. Thus, his missionary zeal to be "all things to all men" directed the form and content of what he wrote. It follows then that he referred to the Spirit mainly in the past tense recalling the events of his original mission.

In 1 Corinthians there is no mention of the idea that the Spirit performs any activity, either present or future, within the believer. This is probably not due to lack of development in Paul's thinking or to the expectation of an imminent parousia, but to deliberate omissions for pastoral reasons. The believers at Corinth, in a spirit of pride and divisiveness, had over-emphasised the Spirit's indwelling and his miraculous manifestations and at the same time had severed their thinking about the Spirit from Christ crucified and from God. Thus, Paul purposely omitted any mention of the Spirit's present activities within the believer to direct their allegiance and attention back to Christ and God. Hence, the ethical motivation given by him in 1 Corinthians is basically the injunction to obey the Lord who is coming in judgment rather than to follow the guidance of the indwelling Spirit.

Paul does not have a fixed use of πνεῦμα for Spirit of God. For example, πνεῦμα in 1 Cor. 2:4 has little theological content for it is simply used here in a general historic way. Instead of referring to the Spirit of God as being similar to the free-acting spirits of the world he described Him in terms of the human spirit. Just as the human spirit is man's invisible self within a body, so the Spirit of God in revelation is God's self within a singular or corporate body.

THE HOLY SPIRIT

IN

1 CORINTHIANS

A study of Paul's pneumatology in 1 Corinthians with particular reference to the context of the Spirit passages in the letter and to the situation in Corinth

P. L. WATKINS

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

1972

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

A B R	Australian Biblical Review
Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich	A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature
B J R L	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
B R	Biblical Research
C B Q	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
1 Cor.	Commentary on 1 Corinthians (Similarly other N.T. Commentaries)
E T	Expository Times
E.T.	English Translation
H T R	Harvard Theological Review
Interp	Interpretation; a Journal of Bible and Theology
J B L	Journal of Biblical Literature
J E S	Journal of Ecumenical Studies
J T S	Journal of Theological Studies
N.E.B.	New English Bible
N T	Novum Testamentum
N T S	New Testament Studies
R B	Revue biblique
R.S.V.	Revised Standard Version
S B T	Studies in Biblical Theology
S J T	Scottish Journal of Theology
T L Z	Theologische Literaturzeitung
T.N.T.	Theology of the New Testament - R. Bultmann
T W N T	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (E.T. of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament - ed. G. Kittel)

U.B.S.	United Bible Societies text of the Greek New Testament
Z N W	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

PREFACE

I would like to thank my supervisor the Reverend C. E. B. Cranfield for his assistance and his advice in the preparation of this thesis. I am also greatly indebted to Mrs Elizabeth Jago who typed the final manuscript and to my wife Margaret who assisted in checking it.

Except where otherwise indicated, the Greek text used in this study is the Novum Testamentum Graece (Stuttgart) 1963 of Nestle and Aland. English quotations of the Bible are taken from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyrighted 1946 and 1952.

CHAPTER 1

METHOD AND APPROACH

It is common for students of Pauline pneumatology to determine an over-all theology of the Spirit from the whole Pauline corpus and then to apply this theology to each letter. For example, if the Spirit is clearly an eschatological entity in Romans and 2 Corinthians, there is often a distinct tendency, almost a desire, to find this in 1 Corinthians (or any other of his letters). Another way of arriving at the same conclusion is to find that eschatology looms large in 1 Corinthians and that it does so with regard to the Spirit in his other letters - therefore the Spirit must be an eschatological concept in 1 Corinthians. Undoubtedly such methodology is at fault. This erroneous method glosses over not only the possibility of changes or development in Paul's thinking (1) but also the possibility that Paul himself deliberately presented his gospel to different groups in varying ways. It also tends to neglect the possibility that Paul, on occasions, may not have used the term "Spirit" in exactly the way he would have done if he had been writing a thesis about the Spirit. We know, for example, that he took up catch-phrases of the Corinthians ("all things are lawful", 6:12; "we are kings", 4:8), modified and used them to his own advantage. Additionally, such a method takes little or no account of the possibility that Paul may have used a term theologically in one context and non-theologically in another.

We do not necessarily call into question Pauline studies which collate all his letters to determine his theology, but we suggest that every aspect of Paul's thinking about the Spirit may not appear in one letter. In addition, in his early letters he may not have developed his thinking to the heights found in Romans. Consequently, there is a place for a study of "The Holy Spirit in 1 Corinthians" which takes into account the underlying causes for Paul's use of the term Spirit, its meaning, place in context and the possible reactions of his readers to what he says. To our knowledge, no serious studies treat the subject of the Holy Spirit in 1 Corinthians alone. (2)

Unfortunately one problem immediately arises. In some contexts in 1 Corinthians there are insufficient detailed statements about the Spirit for the exegete to determine with certainty and completeness what Paul meant by them. Yet we know (some may question this) that the same man with basically the same theology wrote all these letters. It follows that his other letters must be considered carefully, especially for this reason, but they must remain secondary to the letter itself. They must remain "tools of trade" just as, although to a lesser degree, information about Corinth from profane writers is a "tool of trade".

What method and approach is therefore suitable for a study of this kind? In some cases it will mean assuming that we can enter into the circumstances and thoughts of the recipients of 1 Corinthians (and of Paul) more than the evidence may seem to warrant. This is not to suggest that resultant reconstructions

are erroneous but that doubts must still remain about the conclusions reached. Nevertheless, this in itself is a worthwhile investigation particularly as fresh internal studies and external evidence continue to extend our knowledge, confirming some assumptions and disproving others.

What is vital methodologically is that all evidence must be given a fair hearing and weighed according to its relative merit. It may be impossible to state objectively in every case which evidence is the most important, but in the past most studies on the Spirit in Paul's letters have almost completely disregarded or underestimated the importance of the differences between his letters. Each letter is a unit in itself. They were not written as systematic accounts of Christian doctrine, but to correct particular errors and to encourage particular groups and individuals. (3) But although the four main epistles, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Romans are distinctly heterogeneous in nature and structure, this does not compel us to conclude that they were all written by different authors. Most likely, the circumstances in which Paul wrote each letter demanded a different approach. But this does not in itself exclude the probability of a common underlying theology and a common approach to writing his letters. Nevertheless, on the surface, we see many differences between the letters. 1 Corinthians is cool, relatively impersonal, a collection of questions and answers, whereas 2 Corinthians is more personal, confused and mystical. Different again are Galatians, which is short, vibrant, personal and appealing, and Romans, which is less personal and more systematic.

By considering the context and background of the Spirit passages and by careful exegesis it is hoped to determine what Paul was attempting to teach the Corinthians about the Spirit and also to discover something of Paul's own thinking about pneumatology. As far as possible, the study will be contextual rather than topical. But as some aspects of the Spirit are mentioned in more than one place they must be compared and evaluated together. Sometimes the evaluation will take place at the first occurrence of the subject and sometimes where Paul treated it in most detail in the text. Nevertheless, what Paul says about the Spirit's relation to Christ, for example, is not treated in detail until Chapter 6 as some questions which bear on this topic must be discussed before it. Additionally, although I. Hermann (4) and N. Q. Hamilton (5) consider that the starting point for understanding Paul's theory of the Spirit is the Spirit's relationship with Christ,(6) the practical situation in Corinth when Paul wrote his first letter demanded a different approach by him.

As the majority of scholars accept 1 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Philippians and Philemon as Pauline, this will be assumed in our study. (7) As considerable doubt surrounds the authorship of Ephesians and to a lesser extent 2 Thessalonians and Colossians they will always be treated separately and not used as primary evidence. The Pastorals are generally accepted today as non-Pauline, but even this "certainty" is again being questioned. (8)

Also important, especially in this kind of study where the background and circumstances of the recipients are vital, is

the order in which the letters were written. If, for example, we conclude that we can observe a development in pneumatology from 1 Corinthians to 2 Corinthians to Galatians and then find that Galatians was written before 1 Corinthians we are clearly in trouble. The two main difficulties in such a chronology are the dating of 1 Corinthians and the dating of Galatians. The orders generally accepted are:-

(a) 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, 2 Corinthians, Romans, etc.;

(b) 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, etc.;

(c) Galatians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, etc.

Whilst the majority of scholars accept (b), a few recent studies have cast considerable doubt on the reliability of the generally accepted Pauline chronology. (9) However if there is true theological development in his letters, then it probably goes from 1 Corinthians to Galatians and not vice versa. (10) In the words of W. G. Kümmel "... the composition of Galatians cannot be chronologically far from that of 2 Corinthians and Romans." (11)

It will be assumed for our study that 1 (and 2?) Thessalonians is the only extant letter written by Paul before 1 Corinthians. As the present author does not see development in pneumatology from 1 Corinthians to Galatians (or vice versa) to any important degree then the only place ~~that~~ our assumption could affect us is where Paul's understanding of the Spirit previous to writing 1 Corinthians is discussed (Chapter 2).

Another problem we face is whether Paul was adequately instructed about the situation in Corinth. This however need not concern us greatly. Even if we are not absolutely correct in our assessment of the situation in Corinth it is more important to determine what Paul thought the situation was and how he attempted to right it. Our purpose is to elucidate what Paul actually says about the Spirit and not to decide whether his letter fully answered the problems in Corinth.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 1

1. C. H. Dodd (New Testament Studies) and L. Cerfaux (Christ in the Theology of St. Paul) see theological development in Paul's letters. Two studies on 1 Corinthians and the Spirit which also see development in Paul's thinking in his letters are J. C. Hurd's. The Origin of 1 Corinthians and I. Hermann's Kyrios und Pneuma.

2. The closest is probably Eschatology and the Holy Spirit in Paul With Special Reference to 1 Corinthians by A. C. Thiselton. (We do not include short studies here, e.g. D. W. Martin's""Spirit" in the Second Chapter of First Corinthians," C B Q 5 (1943), pp. 381 - 395.) Other important examples in English which treat the subject of the Holy Spirit in Paul's letters are R. B. Hoyle, The Holy Spirit In St Paul; D. Hill, 'ΠΝΕΥΜΑ' in Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings and E. Schweizer, Spirit of God (E.T.). Other writers restrict themselves to one aspect of the Spirit, for example: G. Vos, The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit; N. Q. Hamilton, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul.

Although not quite so true of E. Schweizer's article, the criticisms of J. Barr in The Semantics of Biblical Language have produced a proper awareness of what he calls "the great and sweeping linguistic misconceptions" to be found in the Kittel Wörterbuch and in articles such as

J. A. T. Robinson's The Body and T. W. Manson's On Paul and John. He rightly criticises those who draw theological conclusions from the form of a language and from the absence of words to express shades of meaning. Amongst other criticisms he also shows that a name for an object can easily be regarded as a concept in itself and warns against statements like that of T. Boman who says "The unique character of a people or of a family of peoples, a race, finds its expression in its own language." (Barr, op. cit., p. 35). D. Hill (op. cit.) in his article on πνεῦμα, treating the word throughout Paul's letters and conscious of these criticisms, has produced a more satisfactory treatment of the use of πνεῦμα from Classical to New Testament times.

3. In the words of A. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, p. 233, "The letters of Paul are not literary; they are real letters, not epistles; they were written by Paul not for the public and posterity, but for the persons to whom they are addressed." J. C. Hurd in The Origin of 1 Corinthians, p. 4, can say "But in general scholars have adopted Deissmann's emphasis rather than its opposite ...." and includes a long list of those who support this view.

4. Kyrios und Pneuma.

5. The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul.

6. See Chapter 6 where the Spirit's relationship with Christ is discussed.

7. So W. G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 178, H. J. Schoeps, Paul, p. 52. However a number of scholars do accept one or more of 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians and Colossians as Pauline - for example: D. Guthrie, New Testament Introduction - The Pauline Epistles, pp. 282 - 294, C. F. D. Moule, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon, pp. 13, 14, L. Morris The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, p. 16 ff.

At the other extreme A. Q. Morton (Paul the Man and the Myth) from a computer analysis of the language of the Epistles concludes that only the first four major Epistles (and perhaps Philemon) are Pauline. He says:

> "Once it is accepted that the first four major Epistles are by a single author the question arises of deciding who he was. In all this book it is assumed, by definition, that Paul is the man who wrote Galatians and so Paul is the writer of all of Galatians and 1 Corinthians and of most of Romans and II Corinthians. He may well have written Philemon." (p. 94).

However, considerable doubts have been expressed about Morton's method and the comprehensiveness of his comparisons with other literature. For example, H. K. McArthur (E T Sept., 1965, pp. 367 - 370 and E T, Aug. 1966, p. 350) questions "the area of applicability of the principle." In addition, E. E. Ellis (Paul and His

Recent Interpreters, pp. 54, 55) refers to a number of scholars, including W. Michaelis, M. Dibelius and D. Guthrie, who question the adequacy of the statistical method as an argument against authenticity. He also refers to G. U. Yule, (The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary, Camb., 1944) a professional statistician, who says that to obtain reliable conclusions the treatise under consideration must be at least 10,000 words long.

J. C. Kirby in Ephesians Baptism and Pentecost, pp. 4 - 56, gives an excellent summary of the problem of authorship in Ephesians. He tends to reject Pauline authorship but concludes with these words -

> "It may therefore be said that these scholars have given us a strong case against the Pauline authorship of Ephesians but that it has not been strong enough to convince many of their confrères who still hold the traditional position". (p. 54).

8. See, for example, D. Guthrie, New Testament Introduction - The Pauline Epistles, pp. 234 - 236, E. E. Ellis, Paul and His Recent Interpreters, pp. 49 - 57.

9. J. C. Hurd., The Origin of 1 Corinthians, p. 12 ff., and a growing number of scholars doubt the chronology of Acts or regard it as inadequate, for example, J. Knox, R.P.C. Hanson (2 Corinthians).

10. C. E. Faw, in "The Anomaly of Galatians", B. R., 4,(1960),

pp. 25 - 38, goes so far as to say that a study of theological development in Paul's letters results in not only 1 Corinthians but also 2 Corinthians being placed chronologically before Galatians.

11. Introduction to the New Testament, p. 197.

CHAPTER 2

THE BACKGROUND TO PAUL'S PNEUMATOLOGY IN 1 CORINTHIANS

The Sources of Paul's Understanding of the Spirit

As we know that Paul's work of persecuting the church must have brought him into contact with its message, and that he himself indicates his own dependence on the Christian tradition (1 Corinthians 15: 3, 4 ff.), we can be sure that, whatever his own independent contribution was to the development of Christian theology, he was well acquainted with the theology of the Primitive Church. Therefore H. A. A. Kennedy can say:

> "Hence it was inevitable that from the outset of his Christian course he should be familiar with all that was essential in the tradition of the Church." (1)

This then must be the starting point in our attempt to find the origin of Paul's ideas about the Spirit.

Because the Gospels, as we have them, were compiled after Paul's letters were written, determining what is genuinely pre-Pauline is difficult and problematic. Even so, the method of looking for pre-Pauline material in Paul's letters used by W. Kramer, J. Munck and others, is probably correct. Undoubtedly, on the other hand, St. Mark's Gospel in particular contains much pre-Pauline material in its primitive form.

Although published first in 1947 and not really dealing with this methodological problem, C. K. Barrett's The Holy Spirit and

the Gospel Tradition is a most valuable study of the pre-Pauline Church's thinking about the Holy Spirit. He deduces from the Synoptic Gospels that although its experience of the Spirit came first, on reflection, the Church saw itself as "... the Spirit-inspired community, the New Israel created by the Messiah". (2) "Jesus was the Messiah: as such he was the bearer of the Spirit." (3) He says that for the Early Church the title "Son of God" was a title for the Messiah:

> "Jesus is addressed as the newly established son of God in virtue of his installation as Messiah; this Messianic office involves a personal endowment of the Holy Spirit which it was believed would be poured out in the last days." (4)

Here was the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecy of Joel. (5) We must return to this concept of the Messiah as the bearer of the Spirit a little later (see below) as Paul does not seem to relate Christ to the Spirit in this way.

As well as their enthusiasm in the Spirit, the members of the pre-Pauline Church did not reject the Old Testament concepts of the Spirit but gradually began to relate their new experience to the Old Testament teaching on the Spirit. Thus, their ideas about the Spirit of God owe little or nothing to influence from the Dead Sea Sect with its doctrine of the "two spirits". W. D. Davies' statement about Paul is equally true of the rest of the Early Church in this respect:

> "The Spirit in Paul is far more understandable in terms of the Old Testament expectation than in those of the scrolls." (6)

But he goes on to add:

> "But this does not mean that the scrolls have no significance for the understanding of Paul, because, as we have seen, they do supply an added clue to the connotation of terms that he used." (7)

C. H. Pinnock in his recent study The Concept of Spirit in the Epistles of Paul also concludes that Paul's doctrine of the Spirit is primarily based on the Old Testament rather than on Hellenistic or on Gnostic conceptions. (8) It is therefore necessary to state briefly the main ideas in the Old Testament's concept of the Spirit. These ideas are not completely consistent and some are not absolutely clear, but the summary given by D. Hill is helpful:

> "Broadly speaking, then, the רוּחַ יהוה is the divine presence experienced in terms of power for action, whether it be prophetic utterance, heroic exploit or righteous living. The רוּחַ is not an agent with its own existence and actions. A. R. Johnson speaks of it as an 'extension of Yahweh's personality', by which he exercises influence on mankind, and Manson calls it 'the power through which God works and manifests himself in the world'. The רוּחַ יהוה is the means of expressing God's presence to, and action within the world: it is the divine, creative, energising and renewing power in the lives of men and communities.
>
> The Spirit of God is hardly considered another distinct from Him; it is God exercising power, communicating himself, or operating." (9)

The unity between the Spirit and God in the Old Testament, which is well expressed in Hill's statement, is also clearly evident in 1 Corinthians. (10)

But more important than any theorising or theologising about the Spirit, the Spirit was pre-eminently a fact in the experience of the Early Church. As the atomic bomb is a fact in the Twentieth Century world even though most people cannot understand its workings or its relationship to an atom, so the Spirit was known as a fact in the early Christian communities. The "Acts of the Apostles" indicates that each new Christian community experienced its little "pentecosts" which were explained as the activity of God's Spirit. Thus H. A. A. Kennedy can say:

> "We cannot tell how early in his Christian career Paul came to formulate his conception of the Spirit along the lines which are discernible in the Epistles. But we know that when he entered the Christian Church he was confronted with experiences similar to his own, which were grouped together under the category of the Spirit." (11)

Thus Luke indicates that the motivation for Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost was to explain the "tongues" phenomena. As shown by most of the non-Pauline books, and the Gospels especially, the Spirit played little part in early Christian thinking except as an explanation for the powers (δυνάμεις) and signs (σημεῖα) manifested in the Apostolic preaching and as evidence of the presence of the new eschatological age. C. K. Barrett has demonstrated that "Spirit" could be virtually

equated with δύναμις by Luke. He says (on Luke 1:17) "... the parallel between δύναμις and πνεῦμα is close"(12) and "... the third Evangelist seems to have regarded "power" as the energy of the Spirit." (13) We must now return to the concept of Messiah in the Early Church because of its close connection with the concept of the Spirit and in particular to the titles ascribed to their risen Lord.

W. Kramer's investigations, (14) at least for the Hellenistic section of the pre-Pauline Church, result in a number of different conclusions from those of C. K. Barrett.(15) By investigating the pre-Pauline fragments in Paul's letters Kramer concludes that "Christ" no longer held Messianic titular significance but "was handed down to the Gentile Christian church in the form of a name". (16) Similarly, he believes that the title "Son of God" means "the pre-existent one who was sent or given 'for us'. Both in use and meaning the title, thus understood, has its origin within Hellenistic Jewish Christianity". (17) He says:

> "This understanding of 'Sonship' is distinctive in that its interest is not in any particular historical act but rather in describing Jesus' significance in terms of metaphysical and cosmological speculation, by introducing the notion of his pre-existence." (18)

When he comes to the Pauline material itself his conclusions are similar. He finds (19) that "Christ" was understood by Paul's readers as a name and not a title, and although Paul probably still had "some latent awareness of the original

connection" and occasionally shows this in his writings, yet even for him it is now a name for the one who died and rose again for them. As well, Kramer says that Paul's ideas of the "Son of God" were cosmological and metaphysical rather than Messianic and in particular it "expresses literally, in a way that the other christological titles cannot do, the very close relationship between the bearer of salvation and God himself."(20)

It seems that Luke regarded Paul's use of the title "Son of God" as a special contribution to christological thinking, for in Acts Paul is the only one who is recorded as using this title (Acts 9:20, 13:33). But the quotation in Acts 13:33 "Thou art my Son" from Psalm 2:7 is also distinctly Messianic. This may be due to what Kramer calls Paul's lingering awareness of the original associations of the title or Luke's own theology showing through as he attempted to demonstrate that "Son of God" was a title of special importance to Paul. However, H. J. Schoeps thinks that Paul's metaphysical view of the title "Son" was a radical break with Judaism, derived from heathen metaphysical conceptions. (21) But more likely, along with Paul's undoubted interest in relationships, he found this way of thinking aptly suitable for expressing his view of Christ as Lord of the whole world and not simply as the Jewish Messiah.

Where he refers to the Spirit in his writings, Paul nowhere quotes or refers to the prophecies of Joel (2:28 - 32) (22) which seem basic to the Early Church's thinking about the Spirit and eschatology. This suggests that in some respects at least, Paul broke with this early tradition.

If Kramer is correct, then we are not surprised to find that Paul did not think of the historic Christ in the Primitive Church's sense as the bearer of the Spirit (as still reflected in Acts 2:33? (23)). The Messianic relationship between Christ and the Spirit as found in the Synoptic Gospels, being absent from Paul's writings, may have indirectly produced an isolating of the Spirit from Christ in the minds of some Christians, as was apparently the case in Corinth. As has been seen with the title "Son of God", and will be seen further in 1 Corinthians, Paul showed himself particularly interested in relationships between the Spirit, the Son and God. Thus we find him attempting to restate the relationships between them in his letters (e.g. 2 Corinthians 3:17) and in particular 1 Corinthians (2:10 ff., 6:11, 12:3, 4 - 6).

We may decide that Paul's concept of Messiah with which he commenced his thinking was considerably influenced by the Hellenistic Church, but it may have been that he thought that the strictly local idea of Messiah was not adequate in world-wide mission. This resulted in the loss of the titular significance of the word "Christ" in his writings and preaching and produced a rethinking in terms of the Lord-of-the-whole-world. For similar reasons he may have found that the eschatological concept of "aeons" was more adaptable in the Gentile world than simply the concept of the Kingdom of God.

Paul the Missionary and Writer

The valuable study of W. C. van Unnik has demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that Paul's early pedagogic instruction

took place in Jerusalem and not Tarsus. He says:

> "... it is clear that ACCORDING TO THIS TEXT (Acts 22:3) PAUL SPENT THE YEARS OF HIS YOUTH COMPLETELY IN JERUSALEM: not a single word is breathed about an upbringing in Tarsus". (24)

A Jew by birth, whose father was a Pharisee (Acts 23:6), Paul was thoroughly trained in the Law and probably became an ordained rabbi and theologian, (25) so that before his conversion he could justifiably claim to have been an excellent example of a pious Jew and an orthodox Pharisee (Acts 22: 3ff; Acts 23: 6ff.). The Torah, which, as G. F. Moore has written, meant to the pious Jew "all that God has made known of his nature, character and purpose and of what he would have man be and do" (26), was the centre of Paul's life and training. But even so, it is apparent that his more liberal training under Gamaliel I, (27) himself a pupil of the famous Hillel, had resulted in his prizing something even more basic than the Law - the knowledge of God's will. In other words, to Paul, the authority of the Law did not rest so much in its being given by God or because of its place in Mosaic traditions or in Rabbinic teaching but in that it was regarded by the Jewish people as the unique expression of God's will revealed to Israel. The primacy of God's will is clearly evident in Paul the Christian, but the seeds of this vital matter were probably sown by his teacher Gamaliel. Our only glimpse of Gamaliel's thinking in the New Testament shows this clearly. In his challenging words to an angry crowd of Jews after Peter had preached Jesus as the Messiah he said:

> "for if this plan or this undertaking is of men, it will fail; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them. You might even be found opposing God!" (Acts 5:38,39).

But for Paul at this stage, the Law and God's will could virtually be equated.

A knowledge of Paul's personality plays a vital role in comprehending his attitude to the Law. The two opposing views, that he was discontented under the Law, and its opposite that he was content, are probably both incorrect, although both contain an aspect of truth. Being a man of definite and strong convictions, although he experienced acute difficulties under the Law and saw many of its shortcomings, he remained content in the conviction that it was the complete expression of God's will for man. He could happily hold these problems in tension and compromise his ideas on all but the essentials. He saw this new Messianic sect as overthrowing the unique place of the Law in claiming Spirit guidance from their risen Lord. However, the earth-shattering experience on the road to Damascus changed all this for Paul. For J. Jeremias this traumatic experience is the key to Pauline theology. (28)

That the crucified Jesus was alive proved beyond all doubt to Paul that this was <u>God's</u> Messiah - this was <u>God's</u> doing. Only God could give life, only God could raise the dead. Thus, the Resurrection confirmed the claims of this group who claimed that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah who had died for the sins of men, that the last days had arrived in which <u>God's</u> <u>will</u> and

power were evident in the Spirit.

It seems then, that U. Luck [29] is correct when he says that the primary matter Paul had to rethink was the relationship between Christ and the Law. Thus W. D. Davies can write:

> "The fact that Jesus has replaced the Torah at the centre of Paul's life has, of course, been amply recognised by scholars."

But he continues with the important addendum:

> "The importance of this for the understanding of Paul's thought, however, has not been sufficiently emphasised." [30]

We cannot investigate these comments in any detail in this study, but it suffices to say that Paul found in the Law-obedient life of Christ (Galatians 4:4, Romans 1:3, Philippians 2:8), his sacrificial death, death-defying resurrection and glorious ascension, all the Law fulfilled and more. His <u>own</u> accounts of his conversion centre, (as does his theology) on the person of Jesus Christ the Son of God. But the accounts in Acts also emphasise that this new Messianic community was guided and empowered by the Spirit which the risen Lord had sent upon them. [31] U. Luck [32] therefore seems correct when he suggests that Paul, who also shared the power and guidance of the Spirit, regarded this guidance as from the Spirit of "him who fulfilled the Law". The Lord who had completely exemplified and fulfilled the Law's demands, now guided his followers through the Spirit of God. No doubt the term "Spirit" was regularly used by the Early Church to refer to the miraculous phenomena accompanying their preaching, but to Paul especially, the Spirit's guidance complemented and

interpreted the Law, as the Spirit was the "Spirit of him who fulfilled the Law". U. Luck expresses it this way:

> "Der Geist, den den Menschen erfasst, ist auch immer der Geist Jesu, der das Gesetz erfüllt hat." (33)

But these statements in no way imply any necessary personal identity between the Kyrios and the Spirit. (34)

From all we know about Paul, even before his conversion, he was clearly a man of fierce certainties, of abundant zeal and single mindedness of purpose. M. Dibelius says of him that he was "of a passionate disposition". (35) Probably for these reasons he was an ideal leader to persecute the Christian Church. (36) But even as a Christian these same traits reappear in his zeal for mission, theologically in his assurance of salvation (Rom. 8:31-39) and personally in his dramatic conversion (e.g. Phil.3:7 ff.)

This zeal for mission resulted from a compulsion to bring all men to Christ, as is seen in 1 Cor. 9:16: "... for necessity is laid upon me. Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel!" and in 2 Cor. 5:14, 20: "For the love of Christ controls us" and "We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God." But such zeal for his converts meant that he now regarded many seemingly important matters as nothing in comparison with gaining a knowledge of Christ. "I count everything as loss because of the surpassing worth of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord." (Phil.3:8). He was therefore willing to change, modify or compromise many of his actions and words for the sake of winning men to Christ:

> "To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews .... To those outside the law I became as one outside the law .... I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some." (1 Cor. 9: 20-22.)

To his critics, he must have seemed an inconsistent compromiser. He chastised Peter for not eating with the Gentiles (Galatians 2:11 ff), yet he himself undertook a Jewish vow of purity in the Temple (Acts 21:23-26). (37) Nevertheless he remained consistent with his principles. All these outward ceremonies and customs were nothing in comparison with knowing Christ. He wrote to the Galatians thus:

> "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail, but faith working through love." (5:6)

As a consequence of this kind of thinking, he removed every stumbling block to belief that he could remove.(38) Provided that Christ was preached, he could even rejoice though the underlying motives behind the preaching were unworthy:

> "Some indeed preach Christ from envy and rivalry .... What then? Only that in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and in that I rejoice." (Phil. 1:15-18)

However, to remain loyal to his principle of being "all things to all men", but not to succumb to false compromises, must have produced within him continual struggles for clear thinking and for conscience. Perhaps this was in his mind when

he told the Galatians not even to believe him if he preached another gospel (Gal.1:8).

We must therefore expect the same missionary zeal and willingness to be "all things to all men" in his writings as well as in his missionary endeavours. H. Chadwick states Paul's intention well:

> "Paul's genius as an apologist is his astonishing ability to reduce to an apparent vanishing point the gulf between himself and his converts and yet to 'gain' them for the Christian gospel." (39)

Although never veering from the essentials, he often changed the form, content and terminology of his letters for the sake of his particular readers in their own individual circumstances.(40) For example, it seems that he used gnostic terminology to the Corinthians in his first letter, but not in his second. Yet years later, he again returned to this type of terminology to the Colossians (if we regard Colossians as Pauline). Gnostic influences were probably at work in or near the churches concerned when he wrote 1 Corinthians and later, when he wrote Colossians.

We can expect that only relevant matters would be included in a letter and in some instances Paul might deliberately omit some teaching because it may have caused confusion or produced some other undesirable result. W. D. Davies makes a similar observation with regard to statements about Christ by Paul:

> "Had it not been for the heresy at Colossae it is possible that we should never have had from the Apostle a fully articulated theory of Christ's agency in creation."(41)

Paul's letters are primarily pastoral [42] with a missionary purpose [43] rather than theological treatises. [44]

As the principle of "all things to all men" is so clearly enunciated in 1 Corinthians (9:12-23, 7:19, 14:19) we can expect it to play an important role in the letter. Paul emphasises his hearers' immaturity, calling them babes (3:1, 13:11, 14:20) who must be fed with milk (3:2,3). This may explain the relative structural and theological simplicity of the letter by comparison with his later epistles. In no other letter are subjects dealt with at such length, for example, spiritual gifts (Chapters 12 to 14), ~~the~~ resurrection (Chapter 15), marriage (Chapter 7), love (Chapter 13), and with a fairly simple topical structure rather than a continued reasoned argument. [45] Many topics treated are elementary in nature, dealing with the very first principles of Christian living, for example, idols (10:14 ff, 12:1,2), and order in their meetings (14:40). And most important for our considerations about the Spirit, he probably omitted deliberately some matters that would cause confusion or were not necessary. Undoubtedly Timothy (4:17, 16:10) would have cleared up these matters in personal discussion when he arrived.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 2

1. H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 98.

2. Op. cit., p. 161.

3. Op. cit., p. 120.

4. Op. cit., p. 44.

5. H. A. A. Kennedy, (op. cit., p. 113) says "The early Christians, quoting the apocalyptic words of Joel, are convinced that all these forecasts have found their realisation through the exalted Jesus."

6. "Paul and the D.S.S.: 'Flesh and Spirit'" in Christian Origins and Judaism, p. 176.

7. Op. cit., p. 177.

8. Op. cit., p. 27 ff.

9. Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, p. 212. Similarly F. Baumgärtel in Spirit of God (E. Schweizer et al.), p. 5: "The Spirit of God is the concept (however much it resists logical analysis) for the activity of the one and only God in history and creation. In fact, it can serve as a direct expression for God's inner being and for his present reality."

10. See the discussion of 1 Cor. 2:10-16 in Chapter 5.

11. Op. cit., p. 111.

12. Op. cit., p. 76.

13. Op. cit., p. 77.

14. W. Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God, Studies in Biblical Theology 50.

15. On the other hand, J. Munck says:
"The Jewish Christian tradition that is found in the Synoptic Gospels was not appreciably remodelled by the transition from the Jewish Christian to the Gentile Christian Churches." (Op. cit., p. 248.)

16. Op. cit., p. 44.

17. Op. cit., p. 127.

18. Loc. cit.

19. Op. cit., pp. 213, 214.

20. Op. cit., p. 189.

21. Paul, p. 149.

22. Paul's only clear reference to the book of Joel is in Romans 10:13 - For "every one who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved." But this well known passage (Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 291) appears to be used with little or no reference to its original context of the promised Spirit, except perhaps in a general eschatological way. Thus the quotation does not refer to the Spirit nor is it used by Paul to recall the promise of the Spirit. It is also unlikely that Galatians 3:14 refers to Joel 2:28 - 32, for this Old Testament passage emphasises the external manifestations of the Spirit whereas "The Spirit here seems to me to be contrasted to all outward things." (J. Calvin, Galatians, p. 56.) The ἐπαγγελίαν is probably more general, referring to other Old Testament promises as well (e.g. Ezekiel 36: 27) and to Jesus' words - Luke 4:19, Acts 1:4 (Duncan, Galatians, p. 103).

23. The words of Acts 2:33 (ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο ὃ ὑμεῖς καὶ βλέπετε) are taken by many commentators to indicate that CHRIST sent forth the Spirit. Although inexplicit, " τοῦτο seems to refer to πνεῦμα " (Lake and Cadbury). That the τοῦτο ὃ could be seen and heard (v. 33) is a difficulty, but as the Spirit is described in similar "visible" ways in 2:3 and 2: 18, 19, Lake and Cadbury's suggestion seems correct.

24. Tarsus or Jerusalem, p. 44; similarly also J. Munck, op. cit., p. 285, against R. Bultmann, F. Prat, W. F. Howard and others.

25. J. Jeremias, "The Key to Pauline Theology", E.T., Vol. 76, No. 1 (1964), p. 28.

26. Judaism, Vol. 1, p. 263.

27. If the account of his training under Gamaliel is reliable. W. D. Davies' arguments for its reliability (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 2) seem cogent as against C. G. Montefiore in Judaism, and St. Paul, p. 90.

28. "The Key to Pauline Theology", E T, Vol. 76, October 1964, pp. 27-30. Jeremias convincingly says: "There is only one key: Damascus. Paul is one of those men who have experienced a sharp break with their past. His theology is a theology deeply rooted in a sudden conversion." (p. 28). He then cites ten aspects of Paul's theology, including the Law, which cannot be properly understood apart from his conversion.

29. "Historische Fragen zum Verhältnis von Kyrios und Pneuma bei Paulus," T L Z 1960, No. 11, p. 846 ff.

30. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 149. Yet while we can accept Davies' view that Jesus had replaced the Law as the centre of Paul's life, this does not mean that Paul regarded the Law as antithetical to Christ. Rather, as Karl Barth rightly affirms in his A Shorter Commentary on Romans, the giving of the Spirit establishes God's Law. For the Law rightly understood through the Spirit expresses

the mind and purpose of God. Thus C. E. B. Cranfield (New Testament Issues, "St. Paul and the Law",) can say:

> "It is clear that we are true to Paul's teaching, when we say that God's word in scripture is one; that there is but one way of God with men, and that an altogether gracious way; that gospel and law are essentially one ..." (p. 169).

31. "The day of Pentecost was considered by later Judaism to be the anniversary of the giving of the Law." J. H. E. Hull, The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 53. But this may not have been the case in New Testament times. "To say that God now spoke through the Spirit as He had formerly spoken through the Law is to come nearer to the truth." J. H. E. Hull, op. cit., p. 55.

Supporting these statements that the Spirit was from the first intimately related to the Law, in the thinking of the Early Church, U. Luck says:

> "Auch Paulus musste also die Christen als eine Gruppe von Menschen ansehen, die sich am Gesetz Gottes, dem Dokument und Garanten der Gottesgemeinschaft Israels, verging. Er musste hier eine der vielen Strömungen erkennen, die von allen Seiten her die Geltung des Gesetzes unterminierten." Op. cit., p. 846.

32. Op. cit., p. 848

33. Loc. cit.

34. For further discussion on the relationship between Christ and the Spirit see Chapter 6.

35. Paul, p. 48.

36. The theory of E. Barnikol that Paul may have been a Jewish missionary before his conversion is not improbable, Die vor- und Frühchristliche Zeit des Paulus, Kiel, 1929, p. 18 ff. H. J. Schoeps also regards this as possible, Paul, p. 168.

37. Although the historicity of the incident is doubted by some, Günther Bornkamm in an article entitled "The Missionary Stance of Paul in 1 Corinthians 9 and in Acts" in Studies in Luke - Acts, (p. 207, note 28) raises the valuable argument:

> "Had this report (of the vow) been only a tendentious legend, the narrator probably would have chosen some other example as a climactic conclusion for proving Paul's faithfulness to the law; he would hardly have selected this eccentric ceremony of Acts 21: 24 ff."

For further discussion, see pp. 204, 205 of Bornkamm's article.

38. G. Bornkamm states the meaning of 1 Corinthians 9: 19-23 well:

"Both the context of 1 Cor. 9: 19-23 and the content of these verses themselves show that Paul could not modify the gospel itself according to the particular characteristics of his hearers. The whole of his concern is to make clear that the changeless gospel, which lies upon him as his ἀνάγκη (9:16), empowers him to be free to change his stance. This means, however, that in the light of the gospel, Paul no longer recognises as such the religious positions of the various groups described. ... but he does recognise their respective positions as the historical places (Standorte) where the "calling" of each man occurs through the gospel." Studies in Luke - Acts, p. 196.

39. ""All Things To All Men" (1 Cor. IX. 22)," N T S 1, 1955, p. 275.

40. "Paul intends the statements (of 1 Corinthians 9: 19 ff.) to characterize a practical stance of solidarity with various groups, rather than to describe several ways of adjusting his preaching in terms of content and language to various environments." G. Bornkamm, Studies in Luke - Acts, p. 202.

Taken at its face value this statement of Bornkamm's is self-contradictory. It is surely impossible for any teacher (or preacher) who starts from where his pupils are, not to choose his language, content and presentation appropriately for the particular group he is addressing.

But he probably means that Paul never compromised the Gospel.

41. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 177.

42. J. Munck, op. cit., p. 34.

43. J. Munck, (op. cit., p. 200) dependent on T. W. Manson "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans and Others," B J R L 31, 1948, pp. 224 - 240, includes Romans as written for missionary purposes.

44. H. Conzelmann,"Paulus und die Weisheit," N T S 12, (3, 1966) pp. 231 - 244,has recently suggested that the "studied" look of some sections of Paul's letters may be the result of Paul setting up a theological school and regularly working over his material.

We know nothing of the first fourteen years of Paul the Christian, and as a scholar we should expect him to have written down some basic theses about Christianity. These may have been used by him as a basis for his earlier epistles. At first reading the four major epistles do seem like theological treatises. It seems unlikely that the extremely careful use of terms and precision found in them could be "off the cuff". It is clear from 2 Timothy 4:13 that Paul (let us presume it was Paul for the moment) had left some vital manuscripts (Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich suggests "codices") and books behind. Were these the basic statements of faith? Paul may then have

composed the Pastorals from material readily available to him, resulting in a patch-work look and emphasising the need to follow the traditions (his manuscripts). Timothy is to guard what is committed to him (1 Timothy 4: 16, 6: 20; 2 Timothy 1: 12, 13; 2: 2, 14, 15, 23, 24; 3: 10; similarly Titus also - Titus 1: 9, 13; 2: 1, 7, 10) and to pay attention to reading (1 Timothy 4: 6, 13; 6:3).

45. This does not exclude the probability that Paul developed his argument carefully and logically, as for example, in the manner suggested by K. Barth in The Resurrection of the Dead.

CHAPTER 3

THE SITUATION IN CORINTH

Disputes Within the Congregation

That there were internal quarrels in the Corinthian Church when Paul wrote to them is self-evident from the letter. But the following questions about this trouble are difficult to answer. Who were the people causing the divisions (σχίσματα 1:10, 11:18, 12:25)? What was the nature of the argument(s) and were there a number of different significant disputes, each having its own group of protagonists?

In 1 Cor. 1-4, Paul refers to members of the Corinthian congregation who regard themselves as belonging to Paul, Apollos, Cephas and Christ. This has made some scholars(1) conclude that these names represent "parties" within the Corinthian Church. Attempts were then made to determine the distinguishing features of these "parties" and to describe the nature of the disputes.(2) However, some other scholars(3) consider that "parties" of this kind did not exist within the Corinthian assembly. Thus W. G. Kümmel can say:

> "But in reality the supposition is completely erroneous that Paul reckons with the existence of closed groups in the congregation."(4)

Similarly C. K. Barrett, although recognising some theological differences within the Corinthian Church, can say:

> "The existence of these groups does not mean that the Corinthian Church was split into completely disunited fragments."(5)

J. Munck has at least shown that the problem of divisions in the church at Corinth has been overdone, and he is probably correct in saying:

> "Not only were there no factions, but there was also no Judaizing in the church at Corinth at the time when Paul wrote his first letter to the Corinthians."(6)

In substantiating this, Munck's argument is long and carefully reasoned and so cannot be presented here at length. However, a few of his points need to be mentioned as they bear on the understanding of 1 Corinthians Chapter 2 and later, Chapters 12 to 14.

He notes that "αἱρέσεις", the word which would be used for theological divisions, is only used at 11:19 where it is in an eschatological setting, whereas σχίσμα, which is found at 1:10, 11:18 and 12:25, in context does not have a theological emphasis but means not factions, but simply temporary "divisions among church members for non-theological reasons".(7)

Munck suggests that there were three errors in the Corinthian Church which Paul attempted to correct. They regarded the gospel as a kind of wisdom superior to the Greek philosophical wisdom of the day. This led to hero worship of the Christian leaders and finally to thinking of themselves as wise.(8) That is, many of the Christians at Corinth regarded the new wisdom of Christianity as a higher wisdom and probably thought of speaking in "tongues" as a miraculous ability only possessed by those who were superior ("spiritual"). This resulted in an idolising of their leaders and in personal pride.

It is this pride[9] that Paul aimed to curb (particularly in 1 Corinthians Chapters 1 to 4) by demonstrating the true nature of the Almighty God, His gospel and His church. The issue was quite clear - they were turning from God to man. They had forgotten that the gospel was not a superior philosophy of men, but the preaching of God's wisdom, a crucified Jewish Messiah, regarded by men as foolishness (1:18-25). God's messengers were not eloquent but weak and trembling men and their weakness contrasted with and demonstrated God's power (2:1-4). This power He revealed through His own Spirit (2:10-16). If they rightly regarded themselves as servants of men, Christian leaders had no cause for pride because God had produced the results (3: 6-9, 4: 1-13). There was no place for boasting (1:29, 31; 3: 19-23; 4:6, 18-20). This overwhelming emphasis on God in Chapters 1 to 4 is brought out strikingly by K. Barth with his use of italics in The Resurrection of the Dead:

> "They no longer realise that all they are and all they have has been received from God;"[10]
>
> "Turn over a new leaf, return to the cause, to God's cause now."[11]
>
> "But meet Christ, God's power, God's wisdom (1. 22-25)."[12]

and he concludes that the basic error at Corinth was:

> "the understanding or the failure to understand the three words apo tou theou (from God)."[13]

J. Glenn in his very stimulating book Pastoral Problems in 1 Corinthians offers a similar interpretation to that of Munck, but sees the hero worship as a new form of idolatry. Although Paul does not explicitly say this, it is clear, from

his continual condemnation of idolatry [14] in the letter, that he is very conscious of his converts' environment of Greek Philosophy, immorality and idolatry. Having rejected their previous idolatrous "lords", he desires their complete rejection of idolatry and its accompanying way of life. Finally, perhaps intimately related to the basic problems already mentioned, there may have been trouble between the sexes which produced further lack of order in the Corinthian assemblies. [15] We must now consider the matter of parties, gnostic influences and spirit enthusiasts in more detail.

The Gnostic[16] Spirit Enthusiasts

Although the idea that separate parties existed in the Corinthian Church is probably not true, it is generally agreed that much of the trouble which Paul tried to eradicate in Corinth stemmed from a gnosticising group who called themselves "the Spiritual Ones" (see 3:1, 12:1, 14:37). J. C. Hurd concludes his discussion of the "parties" in Corinth with:

> "In the face of the critical difficulties which surround the attempt to put flesh on the bare references in 1 Cor. 1.12 a number of scholars prefer to discuss the point of view of Paul's opponents without fixing on any particular party by name. Thus K. Lake and Enslin characterize them simply as the "spirituals", denying that they were Judaizers. And Bultmann, Käsemann and Dinkler deal with the situation in terms of a Hellenistic and mystic "pre-Christian Gnosis". Jacques Dupont, on the other hand, understands the "wisdom" of the Corinthians to derive

> mainly from charismatic Jewish-Christians from Palestine. And Schoeps, too, emphasizes the Jewishness of Paul's opposition at Corinth in conscious opposition to Lütgert and his followers." (17)

It seems that some Christians at Corinth had entered the Church wholeheartedly but proved themselves incapable of breaking completely with their gnostic backgrounds without further apostolic instruction. Unfortunately the truth of the gospel became gradually clouded by this gnostic framework of thought. Paul showed his awareness of this tendency by using terms common to gnosticism,(18) especially in Chapters 1 and 2, but gave many of them a christological twist.(19)

Some commentators regard the Spirit enthusiasts as Jewish in origin,(20) whereas others do not, but for our purposes the vital matter is that nearly all agree that the group called themselves "the Spiritual Ones" and that it had gnostic tendencies.(21) Others see the same problem closely related to a false "realised" eschatology. For example, G. Deluz writes: "The Messianic Kingdom seems to have come at Corinth."(22)

It is not possible in this study to investigate gnosticism thoroughly especially as gnosticism is a wide and flexible term which includes different philosophies with a number of common beliefs. There is also considerable doubt about the nature of this common belief, its influence on the New Testament writers and their influence on it. In the words of R. M. Grant:

"Defining Gnosticism is an extraordinarily difficult task since modern writers use the term to cover a wide variety of speculative religious phenomena." (23)

All we can attempt here is to recall briefly the main common gnostic ideas about πνεῦμα Λ

Gnosticism shared with Judaism the idea of the divine πνεῦμα indwelling man, but it also starkly contrasted with the Jewish concept. To the gnostic the indwelling πνεῦμα was not an aspect, part or existence of the independently transcendent Divine, but was thought of as part of man himself, his real self. This real self, consisting of πνεῦμα , was the spark of light derived from the divine world. (24) As we might expect, Paul in 1 Corinthians emphasised the transcendence of the divine πνεῦμα and its oneness with God and Christ to contrast with the gnostic concepts. Also, the gnostic delighted in showing that he could "demonstrate the power of the Spirit that dwells within him by miraculous deeds". (25) In consequence we might expect that Paul would not emphasise the indwelling of the Spirit or the miraculous unless he was also associating them with Christ or God. As will be seen later in our treatment of 1 Corinthians, this is the case. Gnostics also set "spirit" over against matter which resulted in their rejecting any idea of the resurrection of the body (see 1 Corinthians Chapter 15). With deep pastoral concern for the spiritual well-being of his converts, Paul directed his skill and energies in 1 Corinthians against the enticing fascination of gnostic teaching and its influence.

Paul's Previous Instruction to the Corinthians about the Spirit

From the investigations of C. H. Dodd, it seems reasonably clear that the pre-Pauline kerygma was preached in an eschatological context. (26) But Dodd also says:

> "Eschatology is not itself the substance of the Gospel, but a form under which the absolute value of the Gospel facts is asserted." (27)

Thus although the Early Church proclaimed that the new age had come, the content of its preaching consisted mainly of the facts of Jesus' life, death, resurrection and exaltation with little reference to the Spirit. The Spirit was the Spirit of the new age to be received through repentance and faith (Acts 2: 38), but as in Acts 2: 5 ff., teaching on the Spirit was usually introduced to explain the miraculous phenomena which accompanied the preaching. (28)

Like the rest of the Early Church, Paul does not seem to have directly referred to the Spirit in his preaching except to explain that the "tongues" and miracles were evidence of God's presence. His evangelistic preaching, as recorded in Acts, gives the facts of Jesus' life, death and resurrection but stops short of referring to the Spirit. (29) Thus the pre-Pauline Church seems to have done little thinking about the nature and work of the Spirit but accepted the new phenomena as demonstrating the fulfilment of Joel's prophecies. This lack of understanding about the Spirit in the pre-Pauline Church is well described by H. A. A. Kennedy. In referring to Paul's conversion he says:

> "When he entered the Christian Church he was confronted with experiences similar to his own, which were grouped together under the category of the Spirit."(30)

In other words, from the first, rather than being an aspect of teaching the idea of "Spirit" was primarily associated with a fact in the experience of the Church. This experiential aspect of the Spirit in the Early Church is well expressed by U. Luck:

> "The Spirit must be taken above all as a fact, without which the Early Church did not exist." (31)

This would be particularly true in the Hellenistic situation where the Messianic outpouring of the Spirit in the last days would mean far less to the new converts than the phenomena themselves. It is interesting that even in Acts Chapter 2, Peter's speech is recorded by Luke as a response to wonder about the "tongues" phenomena.

In 1 Corinthians, there are indications that Paul, as well as passing on to the Corinthians explanations of the miraculous phenomena which accompanied the preaching of the gospel at Corinth, had also given further teaching about the Spirit during his initial mission or in his "previous letter". The introductory words "do you not know" (οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι) in "do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you" (3: 16), and "Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit" (6: 19), indicate that Paul is referring to previous teaching. It is widely accepted(32) that E. Evans is correct when he says that the phrase is used by Paul to refer to "Christian teaching already accepted, or to matters of fact which the readers ought to have noted and

acted upon".(33) Paul had used the image of the "temple" to teach them that the Spirit indwelt the church. To the Jew this image would immediately imply holiness (the Temple being regarded by most Jews as associated with the presence of the holy God - see Stephen's criticism of this view in Acts 7), but this implication had apparently escaped the Corinthians. Their environment of pagan temples with the associated gross immorality probably militated against the spiritual growth of these new converts to Christianity. (34)

Being a "we" section (35) and containing a number of theological terms which suggest summary form, the statement "For in one Spirit we were all baptised into one body ..." (12: 13) may also be traditional teaching which was known to the Corinthians. Similarly, 6:11 "But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God" has a studied look which suggests that it may have a catechetical origin. (36)

Although we have some evidence from the above material, it is admitted that any attempt to reconstruct Paul's teaching to the Corinthians before our letter must remain doubtful. It is, however, likely that he had <u>at least</u> taught them the following about the Spirit:

(a) The miraculous phenomena are the work of the Spirit. (This may not have been Paul's key emphasis, yet this is probably the main concept the Corinthians grasped about the Spirit (cf. 2: 4)).

(b) The Spirit is given at baptism in response to believing the gospel (cf. 12: 13).

(c) The Spirit indwells the Church and the individual (cf. 3: 16, 6: 19).

(d) The Spirit gives spiritual gifts (12: 1 ff.).

(e) The Spirit is the power of the new age, the power of the Kingdom of God.

However, his very direct approach to the teaching on the Spirit in 2: 10 ff. and also the very careful elucidations in Chapters 12 to 14 suggest that these two passages are, in the main, new teaching.

J. C. Hurd suggests that some aspects of the Spirit played a part in Paul's continuing discussion with the Church at Corinth. He says that Paul had said in his Previous Letter "Do not quench the Spirit, but test everything. Do not abandon yourselves to pagan enthusiasm." (37) The Corinthians had replied "But how is it possible to test for the Spirit or to distinguish between spiritual men?" "You yourself spoke freely in the Spirit without making such distinctions." He suggests that Paul's reply is found in Chapters 12 to 14 and especially 12: 1 - 3. (38)

Yet, although Hurd's suggestions may be correct, it seems that in 12: 1 - 3 Paul was not really concerned to give them "tests" for the Spirit's presence but to show that even those without the spectacular gift of "tongues" also had the Spirit if they could say "Jesus is Lord". (39) That is, they are primarily words of encouragement to Christians who possessed seemingly lesser gifts of the Spirit. Although he may have taught them more than this about the Spirit before writing 1 Corinthians it is not clearly discernible in 1 Corinthians.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 3

1. F. C. Baur and others who follow him (for a summary of this scholarly opinion see J. C. Hurd, op. cit., pp. 96-107).

2. W. G. Kümmel (Introduction to the New Testament) gives the most usual descriptions of these "parties" thus:

> "The followers of Peter are advocates of a Jewish Christianity which appeals to the primitive apostles of Jerusalem .... the Apollos-people can be regarded as advocates of a cultured Christianity of eloquent wisdom. Then we may think of the followers of Paul as such Christians who agreed with Paul and who must have defended Paul's conception of Christianity .... we cannot establish satisfactorily what kind of view the Christ party is supposed to have advocated." (p.201).

3. For example J. Munck, J. C. Hurd, W. G. Kümmel.

4. Op. cit., p.201.

5. 1 Cor., p.46.

6. J. Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, p. 167. So also C. K. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, pp. 45, 46.

7. Op. cit., pp. 138, 139.

8. Op. cit., p. 154 ff.

9. This is also clearly recognised by J. Moffatt (1 Cor., p. 9) and R. McL. Wilson (Gnosis and the New Testament, p. 54).

10. K. Barth, The Resurrection of the Dead, p. 20.

11. Op. cit., p. 21.

12. Op. cit., p. 24.

13. Op. cit., p. 29.

14. For example, 5: 10,11; 6: 9; 8: 1-10; 10: 7, 14-22; 12: 2.

15. We know virtually nothing about Chloe. 1 Cor. 1:11 ff. suggests that she was a woman of means, probably a Christian and that some of her dependents certainly were believers. Although the dissensions mentioned in the following verses are not directly related to trouble between the sexes, yet some of the reports that Chloe's people bring may reflect the woman's angle on matters, such as participation in the Christian meetings. We may also note that a woman's household complains (1: 11); that there are obvious marriage problems (Chapter 7); and that Paul needs to give instruction about the role of women in the Church (11: 3-16; 14: 34,35).

16. In describing the Spirit enthusiasts as "gnostic" we do not use the term in a way that would have described the Second Century Christian Heresy, but rather as an incipient gnostic tendency.

17. The Origin of 1 Corinthians, p. 107.

18. For example, the following occur: knowledge (γνῶσις), wisdom (σοφία), mature (τέλειοι), natural (ψυχικός), spirit (πνεῦμα), spiritual (πνευματικός), rulers of this age (αἰῶν), the Lord of glory.

19. R. B. Hoyle, The Holy Spirit in St. Paul, p. 270.

20. For example, H. J. Schoeps, Paul, p. 76; R. Bultmann, T.N.T., Vol. 1, p. 171; J. Dupont, Gnosis, pp. 371-375.

21. So also W. G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 202; C. K. Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 368.

22. A Companion to 1 Corinthians, p. 47.

23. Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 6. This difficulty is highlighted when A. Richardson (An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, p. 41 ff.) can claim that there was no such thing in New Testament times (he is referring to it in terms of the Second Century Christian Heresy) whereas R. Bultmann (T.N.T., Vol. 1, p. 164 ff.) has a whole chapter on "Gnostic Motifs" where he refers

to its influence on the New Testament. But as R. McL. Wilson (Gnosis and the New Testament, p. 34 - later quoted as Gnosis) remarks, "the conflict is due at least in part to difference of definition". He can therefore say (Gnosis, p. 31):

> "(a) that Gnosis in the broader sense is pre-Christian, and may therefore have exercised some influence on the New Testament; and (b) that there are indications of an incipient Gnosticism, in the narrower sense of that term, within the New Testament period."

He sees an incipient Gnosticism in sections of Judaism (The Gnostic Problem, p. 16 - later quoted as Problem), in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Problem, p. 74), in Simon Magus (Gnosis, p. 49) and referred to in parts of the New Testament itself (Problem, p. 82). For our purposes, the following statement of Wilson (Gnosis, p. 55) is most important:

> "It seems much nearer to the facts to recognise Judaisers in Galatia, with perhaps some 'Gnostic' leanings, opponents of a more Gnostic type at Corinth, with perhaps a Jewish Christian element which may have entered into the situation at a later stage."

24. R. Bultmann, T.N.T., Vol. 1, pp. 165, 166, D. Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, p. 205.

25. R. Bultmann, op. cit., p. 166.

26. The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, p. 36.

27. Op. cit., p. 42.

28. C. H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 17 ff. Few would maintain that the account in Acts 2 reflects precisely how Peter or the Church at the time understood their new power and interpreted the significance of the Crucifixion and Resurrection. A. M. Hunter (Paul and His Predecessors, pp. 91,92) says:

> "Whatever we make of the Spirit's effusion at Pentecost in Acts 2, only the most sceptical would deny its basal truth - that on a definite occasion the Christian believers in Jerusalem were convinced they had received a monumental access of new power for the missionary task confronting them."

But although Messianic expectations connected with the new age and the outpouring of the Spirit can be demonstrated in the Old Testament and Rabbinic writings, it is not clear whether pre-Pauline Christianity was acquainted with Messianic expectations in these terms. Both A. M. Hunter (op. cit., p. 90 ff., p. 145) and C. H. Dodd (op. cit., pp. 22, 26, 32, 33) think it was. But it seems most likely that the Spirit played little part in the early didache and that the eschatological emphasis was not centred on the inaugurated new age, but on the present Lordship of Christ and this Lordship being revealed at the Parousia. (So O. Cullmann, Early Christian Confessions, p. 58).

29. Paul's address to the Ephesian believers (Acts 19:1-7) who were followers of John the Baptist is not an exception, as the special circumstances required teaching about the Spirit. His farewell address to the Ephesian elders (Acts 20:17 ff.) is not an evangelistic address.

30. The Theology of the Epistles, p. 111.

31. "Historische Fragen zum Verhältnis von Kyrios und Pneuma bei Paulus", T L Z, 1960, 11, p. 846.

32. For example, J. C. Hurd op. cit., p. 85, C. K. Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 90, G. Simon, 1 Cor., p. 72.

33. E. Evans, 1 Cor., p. 87. Other occurrences of the phrase are 5:6; 6:2, 3, 9, 15; 9: 13, 24.

34. On the other hand some of the new converts were Jews (Acts 18:8) who should have understood the "temple" image. That there was a synagogue at Corinth at this time is fairly certain. An inscription found in Corinth, the date of which cannot be exactly ascertained, reads "[συνα]γωγὴ Ἑβρ[αίων]", (A. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, n.7, p.13.).

35. See extended note 5, pp. 103, 104 and also p. 77.

36. However, the preceding verses (vv.9,10) and those that follow (vv.12,13) also share the same poetic and repetitive style. See pp.119,120 also.

37. This is partly based on the alleged similarity between 1 Thessalonians (e.g. 1:1-6 and 5:19-23) and the "Previous Letter".

38. The Origin of 1 Corinthians, pp. 292, 293.

39. For further discussion of 12:1-3, see pp. 150-153.

CHAPTER 4

SPIRIT AND POWER (1 Cor. 2:4)

Introductory Considerations

The Inter-relation of 1 Corinthians 1-16. Prior to 1 Cor. 2:4 there is no mention of the Spirit or the term "spiritual" but Paul's commendation of the Corinthians in 1:7 "so that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift (χαρίσματι)" and use of the word χάρισμα , which is particularly associated with spiritual gifts, (1) prepares the way for his discussion of the Spirit in 2:4, 10-16 and spiritual gifts in chapters 12 to 14. Although χάρισμα can be used in the more general sense of God's provisions (e.g. the gracious gift of redemption, Rom. 5:15 ff (2)), yet every use in the more restricted sense of special spiritual gifts is found in 1 Corinthians (12:4,9,28,30,31;) except for one in Romans (12:6). Just as the parousia, first mentioned in 1:7-9, was continually in Paul's thoughts as he wrote the letter, the same can be said of "spiritual gifts". This will now be further elucidated.

Even if 1 Corinthians is fragmentary in nature, it is generally agreed that the different sections were written at about the same time and to a similar situation. Thus, commenting on the arrival of the letter from Corinth and the disturbing news supplied by Chloe's household, J. C. Hurd can write:

"most scholars today think it more probable that both sets of information arrived within a brief period than that the present text of 1 Corinthians was assembled by a later editor." (3)

"What is important to notice is that there is no real possibility that an exchange of information between Paul and Corinth intervened between the arrival of these two groups of travellers." (4)

The practical value of all this for our study of the Spirit in 1 Corinthians is that the letter can be regarded as a unity and addressed to the same situation in Corinth. In other words, the problems concerning spiritual gifts (and the "Spiritual Ones"), clearly enunciated in 1 Corinthians 12-14, were present when Paul wrote chapters 1-4.

There are in fact many similarities between 1 Corinthians 2 (and the early section of chapters 3) and chapters 12-14. It is probably best to put them in tabular form:

(i) The constantly occurring theme of the Spirit (πνεῦμα), 2:4,10-16; 12:1-13, rarely mentioned elsewhere.

(ii) The term "spiritual" (πνευματικός), 2:13,15; 3:1; 12:1; 14:1,37.

(iii) References to immaturity e.g. "babes" (νήπιος), 3:1; 13:11; and also 14:20 (παιδία and νηπιάζειν).

(iv) The mention of the miraculous, 2:4; 12:10,28,29,30.

(v) The use of λαλεῖν for speaking in tongues (14:2,3,4,etc.) may also have this connotation in 2:13, but this is doubtful (especially as it is used in the more general sense in 2:6,7,).

We conclude that chapters 2, and 12-14 can only be properly understood in close relation to one another and in the light of the problem of the "Spiritual Ones" and spiritual gifts.

The Spirit and the Kingdom of God. Before proceeding with the discussion of 1 Cor. 2:4 it is necessary to consider the relationship between the Spirit and the Kingdom of God in the light of the view that states that to Paul the Kingdom of God was a future concept only. N. Q. Hamilton is representative of this opinion when he says:

> "Rom. 14:17 connects the kingdom of God with the Spirit. Whether or not this relates the Spirit to the future depends on one's understanding of Paul's use of the concept of the kingdom of God. Paul's use of it is much more straightforward than the use in the Gospels. With him it is clear that the kingdom of God is still outstanding." (5)

He supports his statement that the Kingdom of God to Paul is a future concept with a number of quotations from Paul's letters where it is clearly futuristic (e.g. 1 Cor. 6:9,10). He gives it further support by his acceptance of O. Cullmann's view (based largely on 1 Cor. 15:23ff.) that the present kingdom is the Kingdom of Christ which Christ will give over to the Father at the consummation and "only then will the time of the new

creation, of the kingdom of God the Father be there." (6)
Having recognised that in the Synoptic Gospels "the kingdom is not only future but also present" (7), he maintains that the present activity of the Spirit in Paul's letters takes the place of the present aspect of the Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Gospels. He says:

> "The role of the Spirit in Paul's teaching is similar to that of the kingdom in the Synoptics." (8)

It is significant that Hamilton's only reference to 1 Cor. 4:20 is to explain it as a parallel to Rom. 14:17 and goes no further. But many commentators also regard this reference to the Kingdom of God as referring to the present. For example, C. K. Barrett says about the Kingdom of God in Paul (commenting on Rom. 14:17):

> "It often refers to the future, occasionally (as here) to the present." (9)

From what we have already said about the Kingdom of God and particularly the relationship between 4:20 and 2:4, we must agree with R. Schnackenburg's statement on 4:20 that:

> "βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in verse 20 can hardly be referred to the future. The very form excludes this interpretation." (10)
>
> "Accordingly, Paul preserves the polarity in the idea of the basileia which we have established in the teaching of Jesus." (11)

We conclude that not only does Paul regard the new aeon as already breaking into the present aeon creating an

eschatological tension, but that he uses the term "Kingdom of God" to express this tension, particularly in 1 Corinthians. Thus in Paul's epistles, the Spirit does not take the place of the Gospels' usage of the present aspect of the Kingdom of God. In fact the opposite is almost true in 1 Corinthians as Paul says very little of the Spirit's present activity within the believer but instead emphasises the Lordship of Christ within the present Kingdom of God.

1 Corinthians 2:4

> "and my speech and my message were not in plausible words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and power," (ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως) 1 Cor. 2:4.

Two factors, one overriding and the other underlying, must take our attention first when considering this important verse. The overriding factor is Paul's emphasis on the enormous difference between the Almighty God and finite, proud man. It is no exaggeration to say that this is the key theological idea in 1 Corinthians 1-4. K. Barth, commenting on these chapters, points this out forcefully -

> "This "of God" is clearly the secret nerve of this whole (and perhaps not only this) section." (12)
>
> "In Corinth the testimony of Christ is threatening to become an object of energetic human activity, a vehicle of real human needs. Against this, the clarion call of Paul rings out: "let no man glory in men"." (13)

This emphasis is clearly seen in 1 Corinthians 1-4 and is

exemplified by "so that no human being might boast in the presence of God" (1:29) and "therefore, as it is written, "let him who boasts, boast in the Lord."" (1:31). Paul describes God's omnipotence as a power operative in and through His servants (2:4,5), in the cross of Christ (1:23,24) and in the Second Coming (4:5 etc). It appears that the concepts of the might and holiness of God, found particularly in the Book of Isaiah, were in Paul's mind when he wrote to the Corinthians as three out of the first four fairly clear Old Testament allusions in the letter (1:19, 2:9, 2:16) are from Isaiah (29:14, 52:15, 40:13).

In a less obvious way this almighty power of God underlies these chapters in the concept of the Kingdom of God. The term "Kingdom of God", rarely used by Paul (only nine times and once in Ephesians), is mentioned three times in the first six chapters of 1 Corinthians. But it is more important, that in contexts where the "Kingdom of God" is not expressly mentioned, such as our verse 2:4, it nevertheless underlies his thinking. In both 2:1-5 and 4:19,20 the contrast is between arrogant speech emanating solely from man and the dynamic power of the King of all Creation. Similarly we notice a close relationship between the Spirit and the "Kingdom of God" in 6:9-11.

Paul's main concern in 1 Corinthians 1 was to clarify for the Corinthians the <u>content</u> of his preaching, Christ the true wisdom and power of God (1:18,24,30). This true wisdom was not a complex philosophical theory but a straightforward account of an event - God saving Mankind through a crucified

Messiah. In 2:1-5 the Corinthians are now confronted by Paul's explanation of the manner in which this message was proclaimed with the purpose of raising their sights to God from undue adulation of the preacher. Some commentators seem to suggest that Paul is still thinking about the content of his preaching [14] but the words "excellency" (ὑπεροχήν), "weakness" (ἀσθενείᾳ), "fear and trembling" (φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ), "persuasive" (πειθοῖς), and the contrast of wisdom with "demonstration" (ἀποδείξει) indicate that he has the manner of presentation chiefly in mind. Even the word "wisdom" (σοφία) itself as used by Paul in verses 1 and 3 does not refer to content but manner. C. K. Barrett says: λόγος "here is rational talk, and wisdom wordy cleverness."[15] Looking at these verses in a different way, we can say that the very weakness of the presentation in contrast to the obvious results demonstrated that the King was active in the preaching.

A Discussion of "Power" (δύναμις) in 1 Cor. 2:4. δύναμις, a word used fairly regularly by Paul, is a general word he employs in ways such as a man's power or ability (2 Cor.1:8), God's power, the power of signs (Rom. 15:19) and so on. Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich gives the following main meanings: (i.) power, strength, (ii.) ability, capacity, (iii.) meaning, (iv.) outward expression of power (usually in the plural), (v.) resources.

In 1:24 Christ has been called "the power of God and the wisdom of God" (similarly 1:17 and 18), but it is also said

of him that he has been made (ἐγενήθη) "our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption" (1:30). Whilst it is recognised that Christ is at the centre of these activities of God mentioned in verse 30, yet at the same time each activity is a wider concept than the work of Christ. In a similar way, the expression "power of God" has wider connotations than simply Christ himself. We cannot agree with W. Grundmann who (in commenting on verses 1-5) virtually equates δύναμις with Christ, and continues -

> "The final sentence (v.5) excludes the understanding of δύναμις as the power of miracles..... δύναμις relates to the content of his preaching rather than the form." (16)

Certainly verse 5 is closely related to 2:4 and 1:24 but this does not prove that Paul is continuing to use δύναμις in the restricted sense of 1:24. The idea of δύναμις is most closely related to the concepts of God and the Kingdom, for example 4:19,20. Nowhere else in 1 Corinthians does Paul use δύναμις in the restricted sense of 1:24. The case for identifying δύναμις in verses 1-5 with Christ is also diminished by the use of σοφία in these verses. Whereas in 1:24 Christ is called both δύναμις and σοφία, here this is noticeably not the case. Men, and not God or Christ, are the ones who use words of σοφία. Although δύναμις is still used in a good sense, it must be assumed that in verses 1-5, as there is no evidence to the contrary, Paul is probably using δύναμις in the usual sense meaning "power", "ability" or "resource".

Has "Spirit and Power" a Fixed Meaning? Paul regularly associates the two words πνεῦμα and δύναμις in a way that suggests that "Spirit and power" was almost a formula for him, possessing a relatively fixed meaning. For convenience throughout the discussion, "Spirit and power" will be designated "the expression". Paul uses the expression in slightly varying forms on four occasions (1 Cor. 2:4, Rom. 15:19, Gal. 3:5, 1 Thess. 1:5) and also associates πνεῦμα and δύναμις in another four instances (Rom. 1:4, 15:13, 1 Cor. 6:6,7 and perhaps Eph. 3:16). The expression is also found five times in Luke's works (Lk. 1:17, 35, 4:14, Acts 1:8, 10:38).

With regard to the meaning of the expression in 1 Cor. 2:4, scholarly opinion is divided. Some regard it as a hendiadys whereas others do not. J. Moffatt comments on this verse "Indeed the two words are practically a hendiadys".(17) This view will be considered first.

D. W. Martin remarks that, amongst the group of scholars who see a hendiadys here, "there is a great variety of interpretations of the passage. Many of them consider "power" as a reference to miracles." (18) For them the expression means "the demonstration of the power of the Spirit". As the present writer is in basic agreement with this meaning for δύναμις (with the slight modification of "external evidences" of power instead of "miracles"), it will not be further considered here. The implications for the meaning of πνεῦμα need not be considered at this stage because any such shortcomings will be clearly apparent later.

While still regarding the expression as a hendiadys, another view as to its meaning is expressed by E-B. Allo:(19)

> "Y a-t-il joint des miracles opérés par lui-même? La chose paraît bien possible, d'après II Cor. XII, 12, mais nous croyons plutôt, avec J. Weiss, que δύναμις ici, ne signifie pas 'miracle'."

Allo prefers to see the whole expression as referring to the inner conviction and change of heart, especially as there is no mention of miracles at Corinth in Acts. By itself, the omission of any mention of miracles in Acts has little weight as an argument. Furthermore, although Paul desires to emphasise the inner fruit of the Spirit at the expense of "tongues" in particular because of an obsession with such phenomena at Corinth, he does not refrain from mentioning that he in fact had spoken in tongues (14:18) and that they are gifts of the Spirit (12:10). He also refers to them as confirming his true apostleship (2 Cor. 12:12).

Whilst many scholars regard πνεῦμα and δύναμις in 1 Cor. 2:4 as a hendiadys, there is strong evidence to suggest that Paul did not mean it to be understood in this way. On a number of occasions πνεῦμα, especially in the gospels, is joined by an "and" to an explanatory or complementary word such as ὕδωρ (Jn 3:5), πῦρ (Matt. 3:11, Lk. 3:16) or δύναμις (Lk. 1:35). But this is not the case in Paul's writings. Excluding δύναμις, the only word that is so employed by Paul is "body" (σῶμα) which although having some aspects of similarity also clearly contrasts with πνεῦμα (for example 1 Cor. 7:34 - "And the unmarried woman or girl

is anxious about the affairs of the Lord, how to be holy in body and spirit"). (20) As the link word καί (rather than δέ or ἀλλά) in the expression does not in itself suggest a contrast, there is no reason to expect a deep contrast between δύναμις and πνεῦμα . (21) Instead, it seems right to look for some similarities and some differences.

In order to fully understand the expression it is necessary to consider two important factors -

(a) What is the theoretical meaning of the expression (that is, the way Paul would like his readers to interpret it)?

(b) Does the expression also have an everyday meaning different from (a) to which his readers would be accustomed?

Factor (a), the theoretical meaning of the expression, will now be considered.

The verses Rom. 15:19, 1 Cor. 2:4, 1 Thess. 1:5 and Gal. 3:5 (22) have three significant features in common. First, δύναμις and πνεῦμα occur together without the use of a genitive such as in Rom. 15:13. This verse (Rom. 15:13) and Rom. 15:19 show that Paul normally uses the genitival construction if he wants to say that the Spirit is powerful. Although δύναμις καὶ πνεῦμα may be an alternative way of saying the same thing, it seems more likely that it is not the case. Romans 15:19 supports this view:

ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος

Here two demonstrations of power are clearly distinguished, outward signs and those of the Spirit. (23) Second, in each case, and explicitly in 1 Thess. 1:5, the expression refers to the manner of his preaching rather than to its content.

Whilst the style and presentation of Paul's preaching could not match the skilled rhetoric of the Corinthian philosophers ("in plausible words of wisdom" - 2:4a), yet his preaching was accompanied by demonstrations of power. God witnessed to His presence by miracles and by changing men's lives (12:2). Third, and most important, each verse refers to the results of Paul's missionary preaching, showing that his work was effective among the church there. This is the main reason for regarding "Spirit and power" as an expression flexible in form but fixed in overall meaning. Each usage looks back to the "little pentecosts" that occurred when Paul began his preaching in that place.

With regard to the churches which Paul himself founded, in Corinth, Thessalonica and Galatia, he used the expression expecting it to be known and given assent. Unequivocal assent to his assertion that his gospel came to them in "Spirit and power" was essential to his argument. We may reasonably conclude that each of these verses (1 Cor. 2:4, 1 Thess. 1:5, Gal. 3:5, Rom. 15:19) indicates that Paul and his converts knew and used the expression δύναμις καὶ πνεῦμα in slightly varying forms as a way of describing the manner and results of his preaching.

Whatever the expression's origin [24] and meaning in the Early Church, the two words seem almost synonymous to Luke,[25] but not to Paul. K. Stalder expresses our conclusion well - "it is not Pauline to identify pneuma with dunamis".[26]. For Paul the expression δύναμις καὶ πνεῦμα became an excellent

summary of the results of his missionary preaching. If it is accepted that behind each of these verses under consideration there lies a common thought pattern in Paul's mind, then it is far easier to interpret the verse in question, 1 Cor. 2:4.

The word δύναμις will be considered first. The clearest indication of what δύναμις means in the expression occurs in Rom. 15:19 "in the power of signs and wonders". This suggests that in each occurrence of the expression, the word means overt demonstrations of God's power, such as conversions, miracles, tongues and prophesying. Although δύναμις is normally in the plural when meaning miracles, yet the singular is used in 2 Thess. 2:9 (which may be Pauline) and in some of the plural occurrences, δύναμις occurs with other words in the plural (e.g. 1 Cor. 12:10, 28ff.) suggesting that plurality is probably not essential for it to mean "obvious displays of power" such as miracles. It is probably significant that in two of these verses (Rom. 15:19, 1 Thess. 1:5) the context is not a theological argument but concerns general statements about Paul's missionary work. In these πνεῦμα occurs after δύναμις . But in Gal. 3:5 and 1 Cor. 2:4 where the discussion is complex, involving the work of the Spirit, πνεῦμα <u>precedes</u> δύναμις .

The fullest reference to πνεῦμα in this double expression is in 1 Thess. 1:4,5:

> "For we know, brethren beloved by God, that he has chosen you; for our gospel came to you not only in word, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit and with full conviction".

G. G. Findlay [27] is representative of many others when he comments on the expression ἐν πνεύματι ... πολλῇ :

> "the single ἐν [28] combines these adjuncts as the two faces, objective and subjective, of one fact. The πνεῦμα ἅγιον reappears in v.6, 4:8, 5:19; the Thessalonians knew "the Holy Spirit" as an invisible power attending the Gospel and possessing the believer with sanctifying effect".

In other words πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ is explicatory of πνεύματι ἁγίῳ . This indicates that the Spirit is thought of here as the power of God working <u>within</u> the believer to produce assurance and joy. From the context, the reason for their conviction or assurance (πληροφορίᾳ)[29] is clear. They knew (εἰδότες) their election (ἐκλογήν , v.4) for God had called them into His Kingdom and although they had passed through many outward troubles the Spirit's inner presence gave them assurance and joy (v.7) as they awaited the coming again of Jesus (v.10) in obedience to the true invisible God rather than visible idols. We may note in passing the similar background of idolatry at Corinth (e.g., 1 Cor. 12:2).

The word πνεῦμα in the expression "Spirit and power" therefore means - the inner activity of the Spirit powerfully convincing the believer that Jesus Christ and him crucified (1 Cor. 1:19,24) is the power of God leading to salvation (Rom. 1:16,17).

We are now in a position to understand 1 Cor. 2:1-4 and in particular verse 4. The fact that Paul's preaching of

the gospel had been accompanied by miracles, signs and conversions made it certain [30] that the Spirit of God was truly at work. In addition, the very weakness of his presentation and stature also witnessed to the presence of a supernatural power. Verse 5 therefore summarises verse 4. The power of God (δύναμις in verse 5) was expressed in two obvious ways - one by the changing of men's hearts through the inner working of God (πνεῦμα), and the other by overt signs (δύναμις), both indicating the activity of a supernatural power.

In summary, it seems highly probable therefore that the expression "Spirit and power" was used by Paul and understood by his readers to describe the results and manner of his preaching. The expression is probably not a hendiadys, but rather, πνεῦμα and δύναμις demonstrated the power of God, the former referring to God's working within man whilst the latter referred to the more obvious evidences of God's power.

But so far we have only considered the "theoretical" meaning that the expression should have had for his readers, that is, factor (a) above.[31]. We must now consider whether it had an everyday meaning to which his readers were accustomed.

Without minimising the other important teaching in 1 Corinthians on love, resurrection, the Person of Christ and the nature of the Gospel, it is nevertheless true that the concept of the Spirit of God is also very important in the

letter. In consequence, Paul has taken considerable care in his use of the word πνεῦμα, particularly because of the gnostic influences that were at work in and near the Corinthian Church. We must therefore expect his use of πνεῦμα in 1 Cor. 2:4 to be purposeful and closely related to what follows in the letter and especially to 1 Cor. 2:10-16.

It has already been shown (32) that the expression "Spirit and power" was used by Paul and his converts in a general way to refer to the manner and results of his preaching. As well, it has been contended that up to this time the Early Church (including Paul) normally only introduced teaching about the Spirit to explain the miraculous phenomena which accompanied their preaching, and that this teaching about the Spirit was of an elementary nature.(33). That is, the Spirit was regarded more as a "fact" of the experience of the Early Church rather than being a matter for discussion or for teaching. It follows then, that as 2:4 is the first mention of πνεῦμα in the letter, that Paul probably would have expected the Corinthian believers to understand 2:4 in the normal historical way - the way they were accustomed to thinking of the Spirit. In addition, the first use of the word πνεῦμα in the letter by Paul must be very significant because of the clearly emotive nature of the word resulting from the problem created by the existence of the "Spiritual Ones" in Corinth. 2:4 also serves to introduce the whole matter of the Spirit to his readers.

It therefore seems unlikely that Paul would have expected his readers to understand the above expression in, what we may

term, a theological way (as above). Instead he probably expected the expression "Spirit and power" to be understood historically by his readers at the first reading of the letter, simply recalling to them the spectacular beginnings of the Christian Church in Corinth. That is, the expression would be understood as a factual occurrence; the time when miracles and conversions accompanied the compelling preaching of Christ crucified. That many of the Corinthians were obsessed with the spectacular spiritual gifts reinforces the probability of them understanding the expression in this way.

We conclude from this discussion of 1 Cor. 2:4 that Paul probably recognised that the expression "Spirit and power" could be understood by his readers in two ways. At first it would only serve to remind them of the spectacular events which accompanied the origins of their Church. However on later reflection, when they had read the rest of the letter, the fuller meaning that God's power had witnessed to Paul's gospel of Christ crucified by producing inner conviction and by outward manifestations, may have become apparent. Paul had placed himself "on side" with the Corinthian Christians by forcefully reminding them that his preaching in the power of the Spirit when he first came to Corinth clearly demonstrated that he too was a "Spiritual One". As a missionary travailing over his new converts and willing to be "all things to all men", he sought to gain their confidence in this way while at the same time he worked toward a proper understanding of the nature of the Spirit (2:10ff.).

It appears then that Paul can use the word πνεῦμα for Spirit of God intending it to have little theological content in the context of the letter (that is, when the letter was first read by the Corinthian Christians). This fact underlines the need to regard his epistles as genuine letters rather than as systematic treatises in which a word's total content is meant to be understood in every use of that word.

NOTES ON CHAPTER FOUR

1. Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich, p. 887 - "a gift (freely and graciously given), a favour bestowed".

2. Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich, loc. cit.

3. The Origin of 1 Corinthians, p. 50.

4. Op. cit., p. 53.

5. N. Q. Hamilton, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, p. 21.

6. Quoted by Hamilton, op. cit., p. 22, note 1, from O. Cullmann's "Koenigsherrschaft Christi und Kirke im Neuen Testament" pp. 11, 12 (Zür.) 1950.

7. Op. cit., p. 23.

8. Op. cit., pp. 23, 24.

9. Romans, p. 264.

10. God's Rule and Kingdom, p. 289.

11. Op. cit., p. 290.

12. The Resurrection of the Dead, p. 18.

13. Op. cit., p. 17.

14. For example, W. Grundmann, T W N T Vol. 2, p. 312.

15. 1 Cor., p. 63.

16. Loc. cit.

17. 1 Cor., p. 24; similarly R. Bultmann T.N.T., vol..1, p. 156; J. Héring 1 Cor., p. 24; D. W. Martin ""Spirit" in the Second Chapter of First Corinthians", C B Q, 1943.

18. Op. cit., p. 382.

19. 1 Cor., p. 25.

20. This example must be taken seriously as Paul regularly thinks of πνεῦμα in relation to σῶμα when referring to the Holy Spirit.

21. Paul would have clearly indicated this if it were the case.

22. In Gal. 3:5 δύναμις is in the plural. If it is accepted from the argument in the text that the conjunction of the two words πνεῦμα and δύναμις means something special to Paul even though the wording is slightly different in each case, then this plural use of δύναμις does not detract from the general argument for two reasons - (i) here δύναμις undoubtedly means miracles, etc., (ii) the emotional language of 3:1 to 5 has produced some

expressions very unusual for Paul. See further M. Barth, "The Challenge of the Apostle Paul", Journal of Ecumenical Studies 1 (1,1964) pp. 58-87.

23. It could also be argued that the second phrase is explicatory of the first.

24. It is not found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, or Pseudepigrapha, but the two words are associated on a few occasions in the LXX - 1 Chr.12:18 (text A); Ps.32(33):6; Ecc.1:6; 10:4; Wis.1:23; 11:20.
But because πνεῦμα is invisible and has a sense of unknowability it is often paired with other words for emphasis or for symbolical reasons; e.g. Spirit and fire (Matt.3:11), Spirit and water (Jn.3:5).

25. Particularly Lk.1:17, but also 4:14,36, Acts 1:8, 10:38. Against this view T. H. E. Hull, The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles, says: "even when the Spirit is described as a "power", that power is always personal;" p.156. Compare C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, p.77, "the third evangelist seems to have regarded "power" as the energy of the Spirit".

26. Das Werk des Geistes in der Heiligung bei Paulus, p.32.

27. 1 & 2 Thess., p.23.

28. A number of MSS include ἐν before πληροφορίᾳ - p^{65} vid ACℵDG pl lat;S but the key MSS Bℵ and a few others omit it. The Nestle-Aland text omits it and the U.B.S. text only gives it a C preference, putting it in brackets.

29. Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich - "full assurance, certainty ... this meaning is possible in all the word's occurrences in our literature." On our verse they say "with full conviction".

30. Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich - lit. "proof of spirit and power". Robertson and Plummer (I.C.C.) 1 Cor., p.33 would agree with this provided that it means "not a scientific proof but a religious certainty." Similarly C. C. Oke, E T,67 (1955,6)pp.35,36.

31. See page 62.

32. See pages 63 and 64.

33. See pages 41-44.

CHAPTER 5

1 CORINTHIANS 2:10-16

In the early verses of 1 Corinthians Chapter Two Paul contrasts the revealing of God's wisdom by the Spirit (v.10) to the Christians at Corinth with the failure of the rulers of this age (ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) to recognise God's Messiah (v.8). In other words, Christians did not belong to "this age", but their new eschatological existence was characterised by a knowledge of God's wisdom brought to them through the Spirit. In verses 10-16 we see the contrast again, for example - "not the spirit of the world (κόσμου) but the Spirit which is from God" (v.12). When Paul first preached at Corinth he probably presented his gospel to his hearers as opening up the new era of the Spirit, but he does not say this expressly in 1 Corinthians. We can detect the underlying eschatological contrast of the Christian's new experience of the Spirit of glory with his present circumstances of suffering and testing, but overall Paul's emphasis lies on the past. Thus, he does not say they are living in the new age, but that they have received the Spirit (v.10). He appeals to the gospel which was preached (2:1) and to the Christ who had died (1:23). His temporal emphasis in 1 Corinthians Chapters One and Two obviously lies on the past.

Similarly, Paul does not clearly state in 1 Corinthians that the Spirit has a continuing work within the individual. The Spirit is always the one who was active in the preaching

(2:4), who has revealed (2:10), was received (2:12), through whom we were baptised into one body (12:13a) and of whom we were made to drink (12:13b). There are statements about the Spirit using the present tense (2:11,14; 7:40; 12:1-11) and once He is said to indwell (3:16), but never does Paul state clearly in 1 Corinthians that He is active within the individual. This is in distinct contrast to his other main letters where the Spirit is said to lead (Gal. 5:18), to oppose the flesh (Gal. 5:17), to cry "Abba" (Gal. 4:6), to intercede and help (Rom. 8:26), to indwell (Rom. 8:9), bear witness (8:16) and give life (2 Cor. 3:6).

Also, there are no statements in 1 Corinthians suggesting that the Spirit is related to the future or has any future role. This is in distinct contrast to expressions such as "the earnest of the Spirit" in 2 Cor. 1:22, and 5:5 and statements suggesting that the Spirit will have a role in resurrecting the body (Romans 8:11).

Nevertheless, it is not being claimed that when Paul wrote 1 Corinthians he did not think that the Spirit indwelt the believer, but that for some reason he did not emphasise this in 1 Corinthians. In fact he appears to avoid referring to the Spirit indwelling the believer probably because of an over-emphasis on possession of the Spirit by the "Spiritual Ones". As well, he desired to relate the Spirit intimately to the gospel which had been preached and in particular to Christ and God.(1)

We now return to the eschatological aspect discussed above. Although it will be contended that "we have the mind of Christ" (2:16) is a "realized" eschatological statement and that the past activity of the Spirit in 2:4-16 may be construed as referring to the inauguration of the new eschatological existence of believers (though probably wrongly so in the context) it is nevertheless clear throughout the letter that, temporally, the Divine activity can be characterised as:

(1) the past - what Christ has achieved on the Cross and the giving of the Spirit;

(2) the present - the Lordship of him who is coming in judgment;

(3) the future - the Lord is coming.

Since Paul addressed his letter to the Corinthians as a group, to the "body of Christ" at Corinth rather than to individuals, and the problems involved are "group" problems, C. F. D. Moule's comments about the use of eschatological terms are very pertinent:

> "The more the group overlays the individual, the less appropriate do terms of realized eschatology seem to be, and the less adequate is the aggregate of individual deaths as a symbol of the consummation". (2)
>
> "The 'realized' type of formulation tends to apply to individuals." (3)

The Spirit and eschatology is further discussed in Chapter nine. However, before discussing 2:10-16 in detail it is first necessary to determine how Paul uses the personal pronoun "we" in our letter.

Commentators are divided on the question of whom Paul is referring to by his use of "we" in 2:10-16, [4] but for the following reasons it is surely apparent that he is referring primarily to himself and the Christian leaders. (a.) Paul uses "we" in a fairly consistent way throughout the letter to refer to himself and the Christian leaders.[5] (b.) In 2:10-16 he is referring primarily to preaching and teaching. But it must be clearly emphasised that everything he says here about his own gifts of apostleship and teaching are applicable to all Christians. It is typical of his use of "we" in the context of the saving events and message, that he refers to himself as an example to all Christians. Nothing he says here is peculiar to apostles only, but because he knows clearly his own standing before God, he uses himself and the other apostles as examples of all Christians. For to all Christians God reveals his wisdom (v.10), gives gifts (v.12) and spiritual discernment (v.15). Later he reinforces this unity between himself and his converts on a number of occasions in the letter by saying "imitate me", (4:16; 7:7,8; 11:1, compare Phil. 3:17; 4:9, 1 Thess. 1:6).

1 Corinthians 2:10

For the reasons that follow, it is contended that the basic statement of v.10a is expanded in greater detail in vv.10b-16. First, it is a very general statement complete in itself. By itself it is an adequate and full contrast to verse 8. The use of general words ("revealed" having no object and "Spirit" rather than "Spirit of God" or "His Spirit") show this

comprehensiveness. Second, the arrangement of thought in the verses that follow suggests that they are an extension of this basic thought.

"To us .....revealed .....Spirit"(10a)
(14-16) (12,13) (10b,11)

Logically and for simplicity Paul reversed the three ideas: Spirit, revealed, to us.

Third, the literary form of verses 10b, 11 and to a lesser extent verses 12-16 probably owes much to 8:14 of the Apocryphal book Judith.

> ὅτι βάθος καρδίας ἀνθρώπου οὐχ εὑρήσετε καὶ λόγους τῆς διανοίας αὐτοῦ οὐ διαλήμψεσθε · καὶ πῶς τὸν θεόν, ὃς ἐποίησεν πάντα ταῦτα, ἐρευνήσετε καὶ τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ ἐπιγνώσεσθε καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν αὐτοῦ κατανοήσετε ; μηδαμῶς, ἀδελφοί, μὴ παροργίζετε κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν. (Judith 8:14 LXX).

This is not true of v.10a which uses quite different words. Paul may not consciously have expanded the wording of verse 10a but he does expand its ideas. We may therefore regard it as a summary of and introduction to vv.10b-16.

Verse 10 commences with "for" (γάρ) or perhaps "but" (δέ)[6] to connect the argument with the preceding section (2:1-9) and in particular with verse 9. The subjects, objects and actions of verses 9d and 10a are very similar. By closely relating the pointed words "those who love him"[7] with "us" of v.10a Paul answers in advance the question "why did God reveal His mystery to you and not to others?" For God's

revelation is not understood through natural advantages such as honour, power or intellectual ability but through faith (3:5) and love (verse 9d). In addition, it has already been noticed in 2:4,5 that the nature of God's kingdom in comparison with the kingdoms of the world underlies much of what Paul has to say and it also underlies his answer to this hypothetical question.

The second purpose of γάρ is to <u>contrast</u> "us" with the "rulers of this world". J. Héring comments on γάρ : "The conjunction '<u>gar</u>' (beginning of 2:10) must be linked with '<u>alla</u>' (beginning of 2:9), '<u>alla gar</u>' = 'but on the contrary'".(8) For this reason ἡμῖν is in an emphatic position drawing attention away from διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος to this basic contrast between the Christian leaders and the rulers of the world. Therefore the phrase διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος does little more than introduce the <u>means</u> by which God revealed the mystery.

It has already been noticed that it is Paul's intention to emphasise the place of <u>God</u> in the Christian preaching and revelation, so that man's role is seen in its right perspective (see especially 1:29, 31; 2:5; 3:5-9,21-23; 4:1). Although this is still generally true in vv.10-16, in v.10a the emphasis lies primarily on "us".

As attention in verse 10a is focused on "us" and πνεύματος has no qualifying word,(9) does πνεύματος here mean "the spirit of man" - in other words, that God has revealed His mystery in and through man's spirit? The answer to this question must be in the negative for these reasons. First,

the only previous mention of πνεῦμα in this letter, 2:4, is clearly a reference to God's Spirit. Second, it has been seen that v.10a is a summary of verses 10b-16 which refer to God's Spirit. Third, Paul's basic argument in Chapter 2 (and especially verse 14) is that by natural ability alone man's spirit is incapable of receiving the things of God. Fourth, γάρ of v.10b identifies the πνεῦμα of v.10a and v.10b. In v.10b πνεῦμα is clearly God's Spirit. We may therefore say with fair certainty that πνεύματος in v.10a means God's Spirit.

The word "revealed" (ἀπεκάλυψεν) is aorist pointing to a definite time when the Spirit acted.(10) However it is Paul's intention here to emphasise the Godward side of revelation to man, rather than man's experience of it. In line with the view that v.10a is a general statement which is expanded in vv.10b-16, the certainty and directness of an aorist is more important here than its reference to a point in time. Even so, its historic nature contrasts with the theoretical discussion of verses 10b and 11.

In contrast to some systematic theologians Paul rarely uses the formulation "God .... through the Spirit". "Through" (διά) is used by him with the word "Spirit" five times (Rom.8:11, 5:5, 15:30(?), 1 Cor. 2:10, 12:8 but also perhaps 2 Tim.1:14, 2 Thess. 2:2, Eph.3:16) but only two of these also include the word "God" (here and Rom. 8:11).

In Rom. 8:11 we are probably dealing with what W. Kramer(11) calls part of a pre-Pauline pistis-formula in which God is

described as "He who raised Jesus from the dead". Paul does not simply say the "Spirit will quicken your mortal bodies" because he wishes to encourage his hearers with the fact that God has already raised Jesus from the dead. They have within them the Spirit of the Resurrection. Thus this pistis-formula has produced a fixity of expression resulting in the less usual formulation "God...through the Spirit" which is also found in our verse, 1 Cor.2:10.

If the text of Rom. 8:11 is correct,(12) the διά does not refer to subservience of the Spirit but to the Spirit's mediatorial role brought about by His Nature and especially His "nearness" (indwelling) to man. The use of διά in other expressions such as "through faith" and "through Jesus Christ" also show that a fact of "nature" or past action rather than subservience is normally implied by διά . As well, in 1 Cor.12:8 it is clear that διά (when compared with κατά, ἐν of vv.8,9) often has little special force of its own.

It has already been noticed that little emphasis lies on διά in 1 Cor. 2:10a. Its purpose here is not to underline a subservient role or inactivity of the Spirit but to introduce the Spirit into the argument and relate the Spirit to God. Since it has been shown above that verse 10a is a general statement, Paul is probably thinking of the Spirit in a more general way than simply as indwelling the believer. Yet some of the Corinthians probably thought of the Spirit as a power released by the Gospel but not closely related to God's Person. Thus Paul is beginning to correct this here. Hence it is clear

from v.10b ff. that the Spirit is certainly not thought of by Paul as an inactive instrument of God.

It is Paul's intention in verses 10-16 and elsewhere in this letter to extend the Corinthians' understanding of the Spirit's nature and activity. Yet he would expect them to think of the Spirit as they knew Him already. The "Spiritual Ones" were probably influenced by the gnostic idea that the Spirit was the divine spark of life within them. Considering himself emancipated by gnosis, the gnostic showed his freedom in disregard for morality (see 1 Cor.5:1 ff.) and in displays of ecstasy and miraculous deeds. (13) Thus to the gnostic the Spirit was virtually a human ability and no longer the Spirit of the Almighty God. Consequently, in trying to be "all things to all men", Paul used terms common to gnosticism, especially in 1 Corinthians Chapters One and Two, in order to win his hearers back to the Gospel of Christ.

It is certain that πνεῦμα in verse 10b means the Holy Spirit for the human spirit cannot "search everything, even the depths of God". Verse 11 makes this doubly sure. (14) E.-B. Allo who rarely regards Paul's use of πνεῦμα as referring to the Holy Spirit says on this verse "Que cet "esprit" soit le Saint - Esprit personnel, il n'y a pas à en douter,....". (15) Both the act of revealing and the act of searching show that the Spirit is here regarded as personal, (16) but exactly what constitutes this personal aspect it is very difficult to decide and this will be considered later. (17) This key statement, that the Spirit is active in the innermost being of God, leads

us inevitably to conclude with Allo [18] that the Spirit is not just a gnostic emanation but is in some sense God Himself. Similarly, K. Stalder also rejects the idea that Paul spoke of the Spirit as if He were a gnostic emanation. [19] However it cannot be shown from this passage (so also Allo) that the Spirit is not identical with the Father.

The expression πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ first occurs in 1 Corinthians in the next verse to be considered, verse 11. Before examining it here it is necessary to look at the significance of the words τοῦ θεοῦ in the expression πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ as used by Paul throughout 1 Corinthians and in the rest of his letters.

The very considerable use of the expression πνεῦμα (τοῦ) θεοῦ in 1 Corinthians (in slightly varying forms) rather than πνεῦμα alone, πνεῦμα ἅγιον or πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (which does not occur in 1 Corinthians) is significant. Of the twenty three uses of πνεῦμα for the Spirit of God in 1 Corinthians, fourteen are πνεῦμα alone, seven are πνεῦμα (τοῦ) θεοῦ and two are πνεῦμα ἅγιον. But in the other letters of Paul πνεῦμα (τοῦ) θεοῦ is only found three times altogether. [20] We see then that the use of (τοῦ) θεοῦ with πνεῦμα is a special feature of 1 Corinthians needing further consideration. It is also characteristic that the (τοῦ) θεοῦ is used consciously rather than automatically or without thought. For example, Romans 8:9,10 shows a careful use of terms and development of thought from πνεῦμα θεοῦ to πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ to Χριστός (ἐν ὑμῖν). When we consider 1 Corinthians, we notice that in 12:3 there is a deliberate change from πνεύματι θεοῦ to πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

Also in 1 Corinthians 6:11 Paul shows a further purposeful use of the words when he adds ἡμῶν to the expression, and writes πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. Our final example from 1 Corinthians 2:12 is most important. Here Paul even inserts τὸ ἐκ in the expression itself - πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. These examples show clearly that when Paul spoke of the "Spirit of God" he used the words of the expression deliberately and not without care and thought.

Why then does Paul use this expression πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ so often? It is clearly insufficient to say that it reflects an undeveloped use of terms in Paul's early ministry, for πνεῦμα by itself and πνεῦμα ἅγιον, abundantly used in Romans, are also employed quite regularly in 1 Corinthians. It is Paul's emphasis on <u>God</u>, particularly in Chapters 1-4, which provides the answer. The Spirit is the Spirit of the Almighty Creator God so well portrayed by the prophet Isaiah. Paul aimed to demonstrate to the Christians at Corinth who were proud of their spiritual abilities that the Spirit cannot be thought of in isolation from God. We are now ready to consider the very important v.11, where the Spirit of God is compared with the spirit of man.

<u>Πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ and πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in 1 Cor.2:11.</u>[21]

Commentators vary considerably in estimating the importance of the comparison of the expression πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ with πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in this verse. Some see this comparison as a crux [22] whereas others only regard it as a useful analogy.[23]

C. K. Barrett is correct when he says that the analogy is "located rather in the usage of the word spirit than in the realm of being" (24) if his statement does not exclude the possibility that the usage of the word πνεῦμα here can reveal an aspect of Paul's understanding of God-in-revelation resulting from the analogy.

The analogy in verse 11 is probably based on a verse from the Apocryphal book Judith (8:14) or on a saying common in Paul's day. When speaking of the Spirit, Paul rarely quotes other authors or the Old Testament for this is probably one of only two quotations that he uses in his letters which includes a reference to the Spirit.(25).

Of the fifteen other reasonably clear references to Apocryphal books in Paul's letters (there are also two in Ephesians), six are in 1 Corinthians and five in Romans. As Paul obviously had the Apocrypha in mind when he wrote 1 Corinthians, it seems likely that 1 Corinthians 2:11 reflects this text from Judith. Judith 8:14 (quoted above) has a similar line of thought to that in our verse and also the following linguistic parallels with the passage vv.11-16: βάθος , εὑρήσετε , πάντα , νοῦν . However Rendel Harris is a little overconfident when he says: "we can have little doubt that St. Paul had Judith in mind". (26) Although the occurrence of βάθος in Judith 8:14 shows that it is not necessary to regard βάθη in 1 Cor. 2:11 as a gnostic term, it is likely that Paul used it along with other words common to gnosticism to combat gnostic influences in the Corinthian

Church. Unfortunately the passage in Judith provides little further help in understanding 1 Cor. 2:11.

For the following reasons the comparison between the "Spirit of God" and "spirit of man" in verse 11 should be regarded as significant. First, we have noticed that Paul's main argument in Chapters 1-4 was to lift the Corinthians' allegiance from man totally to God. His emphasis lay continually on the fact that their salvation, knowledge of God and their new life had come from God and not from man's wisdom. It is therefore important that he now makes a positive comparison between the Spirit of God and the spirit of man in verse 11. He does not contrast God's Spirit with the human spirit but points out their similarity. This suggests, that, to Paul, the analogy is essential for a true understanding of the Spirit of God.

Second, man made "in the image of God" is an important theme elsewhere in 1 Corinthians. For example, it is stated clearly in 11:7 that man "is the image and glory of God" and in 15:49 that "we have borne the image of the man of dust". It also underlies the Adam/Christ contrasts of 1 Corinthians 15 as well as the use of the "body of Christ" and "Spirit" in 12:12ff.

Third, Paul often associates the Holy Spirit with the word σῶμα and the concept of a body. This is particularly the case in 1 Corinthians, for example 6:19 - "Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you,

which you have from God?", 12:1-31 - "For by one Spirit we were all baptised into one body" (12:13) and 15:44 - "It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual (σῶμα πνευματικόν) body." In fact, he never speaks of the Spirit as active in the world outside a σῶμα, whether individual or corporate. This is not only true of 1 Corinthians but also of his other letters. W. D. Davies is correct when he says "The Spirit in Paul is confined in its activity to humanity" (27) but, in addition to this, it appears that Paul speaks of the Spirit in the world as an embodied Spirit like the human spirit. He never says that the Spirit had any part in creation (unlike Christ, Col.1:16), or any present creative work except within the human σῶμα, individual or corporate. (28)

From the above considerations and from the comparison of the Spirit of God with the human spirit in 1 Cor. 2:11, it appears that when Paul desired to explain the Spirit to others he often did so, partly at least, in terms of the human σῶμα and the human πνεῦμα. But Paul is not saying "look into man and you will find God", but that man's nature elucidates some aspects of God's revelation of Himself in Christ. Thus God can only be known in terms of man's words and man's world. It is therefore necessary to consider Paul's use of σῶμα and πνεῦμα as elements of man's nature in our attempt to understand what he means by the Divine Spirit.

What does Paul mean by the expression "body of man"? It is not possible to give all the current views of the meaning of σῶμα for, as R. Bultmann rightly says, "The most comprehensive

term which Paul uses to characterize man's existence is soma, body; it is also the most complex and the understanding of it is fraught with difficulty." (29) Like "spirit of man", its use and meaning according to Paul is not precise.

Three important views of Paul's understanding and use of σῶμα are those of J. A. T. Robinson, R. Bultmann and H. W. Boers. Robinson says "While σάρξ stands for man, in the solidarity of creation, in his distance from God, σῶμα stands for man, in the solidarity of creation, as made for God." (30) This is typical of the over-theologising view which takes a name for a thing and makes it into a theological concept. It is true that in some references to the body its creaturely nature may be in view, in others its solidarity with creation, in others its mortality, but this does not mean that all are present in each use of σῶμα meaning "body of man".

R. Bultmann's view that "Man is called soma in respect of his being able to make himself the object of his own action or to experience himself as the subject to whom something happens" (31) is open to similar criticism. He also says that in some passages "we can say man does not have a soma; he is soma, for in not a few cases soma can be translated simply "I" (or whatever personal pronoun fits the context); thus, 1 Cor. 13:3; 9:27; 7:4, or Phil. 1:20." (32) Instead of regarding σῶμα as a theological concept for "man" it is better to see these cases as examples of the diverse and blurred usage of the word.

H. W. Boers says : "Thus man's body, this piece of world that he himself is, represents the fact that he does not have himself at his disposal." (33) But, most basic of all, the word σῶμα is essentially the name for that piece of the visible world that man is, it does not necessarily mean anything more than that.

What then does Paul mean by the expression "spirit of man"? With regard to Paul's use of πνεῦμα for man's spirit, E. Schweizer says: "What Paul says about this is by no means consistent or even original." (34) Even so, most commentators see the basic meaning of the "spirit of man" in the New Testament, Paul included, to be the "real or inner self". (35) G. Johnston is typical when he says:

> "In the post-exilic period 'Spirit' became a virtual synonym for 'soul' and 'heart', the seat of intelligence and emotion in man .... and God not only commands heaven and earth, he forms the inner life of man - his spirit, the 'real' personality .....
>
> When we turn to the N T, ... Spirit = soul or the inner self appears in Mark 2.8, 8.12, John 11.33, 13.21; ... The same usage occurs in Acts 17.16 and possibly Heb. 4.12. In the Pauline literature we find examples in 1 Cor. 2.11, 2 Cor. 7.1, 13; less certainly 2 Cor. 2.13; much less clearly 1 Cor. 5.4." (36)

In similar vein R. Bultmann says:

> "When Paul speaks of the pneuma of man he does not mean some higher principle within him or some special intellectual or spiritual faculty of his, but simply his self." (37)

He also adds that πνεῦμα has special reference to man's will and consciousness. From Paul's usage here in 2:11 and elsewhere (e.g. Rom. 8:16, Gal. 6:18, 1 Thess. 5:23) it does not seem possible to suggest that he thinks that only Christians possess a πνεῦμα and that non-Christians do not. He uses πνεῦμα as an aspect of human nature per se and not only of redeemed humanity. In the words of W. D. Davies:

> "From these quotations (1 Cor. 2:11, Rom. 8:16, Gal.6:18) it is clear that for Paul there is in all men, even the unregenerate, what he calls πνεῦμα." (38)

In 1 Corinthians the human πνεῦμα can mean simply the self (16:18), the inner self (2:11, 5:5, 7:34) or the religious self (14: 14-16, 32). Paul contrasts it with the body (5:3, 7:34) and the flesh (5:5, 6:16,17). It is therefore very important that regularly throughout 1 Corinthians πνεῦμα, meaning God's Spirit, is also closely associated with the word σῶμα - for example 6:19, 12:12-27, 15:44, (compare also 3:16).

Thus it seems most likely that in 2:11 "spirit of man" does not just refer to part of man's nature but to his inner self. Elsewhere Paul has used ψυχή and καρδία in a similar way, but here it suits his purpose to use πνεῦμα, not restricting himself to a perfectly consistent terminology in regard to man's psychological make-up. We now return to the analogy in verse 11.

The difficulty that has to be faced with regard to this parallel or analogy of the "Spirit of God" with the "spirit

of man" is how far the comparison can be taken. We cannot necessarily go all the way with the necessity in Bultmann's statement: "Since the human self as a willing and knowing self can be called by the same term ("pneuma") as the marvelous power of divine action, then the formal meaning of pneuma must possess this double possibility." (39)

The aim of the analogy is not to manifest the nature of God "in vacuo" but to explain the revelatory process from God to man. Thus Paul commenced his explanation of God-in-revelation by describing the relationship between the Spirit and God. It appears that, in their thinking, the Corinthians had separated the Spirit-within-them from the Almighty Creator God. Paul therefore avoided the idea of the Spirit indwelling the believer until verse 12 and demonstrated that the Spirit is primarily God's Spirit, capable of searching the depths of His Being. It has already been noticed that the Spirit in the world (but Paul can also speak of the Spirit active within God, e.g. 2:10) is always referred to by Paul in an embodied sense - either within an individual Christian's body or the body of Christ, the Church. It follows then that as the normal context for the term "spirit of man" is in relationship with "body of man", it seems probable that the analogy between the "spirit of man" and "Spirit of God" lies in this somatic relationship. But Paul never suggests that God has a body, for his explanation of the Spirit's nature is only concerned with God as He reveals Himself within man.

Analogy implies dissimilarity and similarity. Gross dissimilarity between the expressions "Spirit of God" and

"spirit of man" clearly lies in the "of God" and "of man". It seems therefore probable that the similarity between the expressions will lie in the use of the word πνεῦμα . Thus it is most probable that in some respects "Spirit of God" and "spirit of man" will contrast with σῶμα in the same way.

There are a number of comparisons between "body of man" and "spirit of man" which lend themselves analogically. For example, the body is material, visible, outer and sensing in contrast to the spirit being immaterial, invisible, inner and knowing. That the analogy is not further explained by Paul in verse 11 suggests that its use here is directly for his purpose of explaining the revelatory process and does not extend beyond this. He means the analogy to deal with one aspect of the Spirit's nature only.

As πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in verse 11 means the "inner self of man" and the analogy with the Spirit of God probably lies in a somatic relationship, it appears that what Paul means by God revealing Himself is, God Himself entering into a human σῶμα individual or corporate. Thus the Spirit is not a Being sent from God or "part" of God but God's presence within man. The Spirit of God which also can search the depths of God's Person shares this knowledge of God with the believer and brings to him an experience of the Person of God. Thus God-in-revelation is called His πνεῦμα and means God's presence within an individual or communal σῶμα . R. Bultmann comes to a similar conclusion: "As a matter of fact, a glance at what pneuma means as divine Spirit confirms what we have worked out for its meaning as human spirit." (40)

K. Stalder's conclusions concerning the Spirit in Paul's writings also stress the unity of the Spirit and God in revelation:

> "Der Heilige Geist ist für Paulus Gott selbst, sofern er aus sich selbst heraustritt und in uns eingeht, um in uns und von uns her in Jesus Christus sich selbst wieder zu ergreifen oder sich selbst gegenüberzutreten." (41)

The detail of Stalder's conclusions may be correct, but as M. Barth has indicated (42) the evidence from Paul's letters is insufficient to confirm or deny his view. However, I. Hermann regards as faulty Stalder's mathematical-type of approach wherein he attempts to discern the nature of the Spirit mainly from statements which are unique to the Spirit. He considers that the concept of the Spirit as expressed by Stalder is only Paul's early thinking (e.g. 1 Corinthians) which developed more and more christocentrically. Thus he says:

> "The thinking of the Apostle is so consistent that <u>every</u> statement about Christ must be understood as a statement about the Pneuma-Christ and that every functioning of the Kyrios must be represented as a functioning by means of the Pneuma." (43)

Although it ~~is~~ may be possible to find such christocentric thinking in 1 Corinthians (e.g. 15:45) (44) the evidence in this letter is very scant. The Spirit's oneness with God, rather than with Christ, is primary in 1 Corinthians.

How then does God differ from His Spirit? This is not completely answered because Paul has been working from two concepts known to the Corinthians (Spirit and God) and has attempted to relate them. For Paul, the term "God" remained distant and aloof, for example, "The foolishness of God is wiser than men" (1: 25,20), recalling the almighty, transcendent Creator of Isaiah 40 ff. who calls out a people for Himself (1 Cor. 1:2, 3:6) and also chooses and sends forth His servants (1 Cor. 1:1, 3:5,6). It is this distant God who at first revealed Himself by sending a partial understanding of His will in the Law and later the full understanding of it in His Son Jesus Christ. On the other hand the Spirit was the supernatural power of the new age, a <u>fact</u> clearly evidenced by conversions, miracles and "tongues".

We now return to 1 Cor. 2:10-16 where Paul's aim is to explain why this Spirit which has been given to Christians is able to make very ordinary men and women "wise". His answer is that the activity of the Spirit is the activity of God within them.

> "For what person knows a man's thoughts except the spirit of man which is in him? So also no one comprehends the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God." (v.11)

It is significant that in this verse Paul does not parallel "Spirit of God" and "spirit of man" exactly, for he says τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ but in referring to

the Spirit of God he only says τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ , leaving out τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ . This has led some commentators (45) to say that Paul then cannot be comparing the natures of the two but only some of their activities. But this is not the case. Paul's answer to the Corinthians as to why such ordinary men as themselves know the mystery of God is that He has sent out His very Self, His Spirit, into their hearts. He leaves out the second τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ because he wishes to emphasise that the Spirit is not just in God but in them. The ἐκ (v. 12) refers to the origin of the Spirit in God rather than suggesting a distance between God and His Spirit, thus supporting his answer that God and His Spirit are "one". His stress lies on this unity because it is the basis of a true revealing of God.

In consequence, Paul calls his hearers and their leaders to humility (1:29, 2:1-7), for it is God within them that has enabled them to understand the Cross, its wisdom and power. Peter, Paul and Apollos have all alike received the Spirit, but this has not made them wise in the gnostic sense, or "superhuman", but produced in them a humility to call themselves slaves, servants and at most "fellow workers" (3:9). God had humbled Himself (2:8,9) by giving His Spirit, not through great orators (2:3) as the Corinthians may have expected, but through trembling preachers. Their manner and message would seem childish and foolish to a Greek philosopher's ears, but their message came with power. Following on now in his argument Paul "descends", as it were, from a slightly theoretical comparison in verse 11 to the world experienced by Christians in verse 12.

1 Cor. 2: 12-16

"Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from (ἐκ) God, that we might understand the gifts bestowed on us by God" (v.12).

In verse 12 Paul continues his explanation of how God reveals His mystery. God did not send bare knowledge to them, but the free moving Spirit of God entered into their lives and shared His knowledge with them. The movement of thought then turns from the Spirit (12a) to the message which He brought (τὰ ... χαρισθέντα).

"We received" (ἐλάβομεν) may refer to baptism (46) as the element of instruction and teaching is present in the passage, but as in verse 10, it is more probable that the total conversion-initiation event is in mind. Λαμβάνειν does not suggest activity in the recipient but in the giver. It is God "giving" or "sending" looked at from the human point of view. Some commentators suggest that as πνεῦμα is used with "world" (κόσμος) and with "God" (θεός) it cannot refer to the natures of both. But here the two are <u>contrasted</u> as in earlier verses (vv.3-8 compare v.10). Because of the parallelism Allo denies that τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ means the Holy Spirit, for he claims that this would make τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου personal (that is, the Devil). But for a number of reasons this is not so. First, as Paul has commenced speaking about the Spirit of God it is unlikely, although possible, that such a similar expression would mean anything different from one verse to the next. Second, the parallelism is not exact. Either the expression refers to the Holy Spirit,

in which case the imperfect parallelism (no second ἐκ) allows one use of πνεῦμα in verse 12 to be personal and the other not personal or (and this is less likely) Paul means something different by it. In contrast to "spirit of man" Paul does not think of the Holy Spirit analogically with "spirits of the world". In fact, Paul never uses πνεῦμα to refer to the powers or influences at work in the world. The addition of ἐκ to the expression "Spirit of God" is explained quite adequately by referring to his aim in this passage (vv.10-16). The ἐκ re-emphasises that the Spirit which indwells Christians has its origin in God and this is why they can understand the things of God. The point of the verse is not the evil nature of the world's wisdom but its insufficiency.(47) This is shown by verse 8:

> "None of the rulers of this age understood this; for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory."

On the use of ἐκ , C. F. D. Moule comments that "a broad distinction has been attempted on the lines that ἐκ means from within, while ἀπό indicates merely the general starting-point," and concludes "it may be that more often than not the distinction holds." (48) Although guarded, this statement by Moule does support our case. The compound verb ἐξαποστέλλειν is employed by Paul in Galatians 4:4 and 6 for Christ and the Spirit being sent by God, but it cannot be insisted that the verb indicates that Christ and the Spirit had their origin in God and share His Nature because the verb is also used of angels, and of a disciple being sent out by God "in order to have him fulfil a mission in another place". (49)

In v.13a the process of revelation is carried a step further. God Himself (Spirit) has come near, entered into the hearts of the Apostles and other Christian leaders and made Himself known to them. The Spirit does not bypass the human agencies or simply use them as inactive instruments, but teaches them the concepts and words with which to express the gospel. K. Stalder puts it well:

> "The word of the Church is never identical with the word of the Spirit. While the Spirit creates knowledge it sets the church at liberty to accept responsibility for extending the gospel. It "can" do this neglectfully or falsely." (50)

Stalder continues and says that the Church is -

> "simply a mere organ of the Spirit through which he effects direct and immediate influence. He leads us, the Church, so to recognition that we as people really perceive and therefore must speak in our own responsibility." (51)

There are only six occasions that πνευματικός occurs by itself (that is, not qualifying a noun) in 1 Corinthians, three times here (including 3:1) and three times in the section on spiritual gifts, Chapters 12 to 14 (12:1; 14:1,37). It seems likely that the "Spiritual Ones" based their spirituality on their ability to speak in tongues. Paul here says that being "spiritual" means having God's Spirit within. It is therefore a title which all Christians can claim as the Spirit has given them all the true knowledge of God (so also 12:1-3). However it would have been a presumptuous title to have been claimed by the Corinthians at that time, as their

ethical living did not reflect the presence of or obedience to the Spirit (3:1,2).

There is much discussion on whether πνευματικοῖς in verse 13 is masculine or neuter. (52) It seems best to take it as masculine for these reasons. First, the fact that πνευματικός in verse 15 and πνευματικοῖς in 3:1 are clearly masculine suggests that this usage also is masculine. Second, it gives the most satisfactory meaning in the context. The progress of revelation is from the Spirit to the apostles. The Spirit then empowers their message and interprets it to those who hear the apostles' preaching.

The question asked in v.16a, "For who has known the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him?" has the obvious answer "the Spirit", from verses 10 and 11. But it is asked in the context of a person who has the Spirit of God (ὁ πνευματικός) being criticised and misunderstood by the natural man. It is clear that this Old Testament quotation from Isaiah 40:13 is Paul's way of saying that just as God can not be fully understood and therefore can not be questioned about all He does, so a person who possesses His Spirit is in a similar position. (53) As νοῦν Χριστοῦ occurs in v.16b it is sometimes suggested that κυρίου here in v.16a means Christ and not God. But Paul also quotes this verse from Isaiah in Rom. 11:34 where κυρίου must refer to God. It is a verse which apparently came easily to mind when, desiring to relate his argument to the Old Testament, he wanted to show that man can never fully understand the infinite God. While it is true

that Paul takes some Old Testament quotations referring to God and applies them to Christ (for example, Rom. 10:13), yet here in v.16a, in the light of his usage of κυρίου in Rom. 11:34, it is very unlikely that κυρίου refers to Christ. Throughout this section on the Spirit (vv.10-16) the relationship with God has been in mind, Christ being last mentioned in verse 8, and here only indirectly. We conclude then that κυρίου in verse 16a refers to God.

The second part of the verse commences with δέ . The R.S.V. translates it by "but", probably to bring out the emphasis of ἡμεῖς and the deliberate change from νοῦν κυρίου to νοῦν Χριστοῦ . However, δέ is normally a weak "but" and as Paul has used ἀλλὰ in the passage (vv.12,13) when he desired to express significant contrasts, it is probably better to translate it by "and in addition" with "we" in italics for emphasis. What then does "and in addition we have the mind of Christ" (54) mean?

It is possibly another way of saying "we have the Spirit of God" for the following two reasons. First, the quotation from Isaiah (LXX) uses νοῦς to translate רוח (only occasion in the LXX) rather than the usual πνεῦμα . Second, ἔχειν is regularly used by Paul with the Holy Spirit (7:40, Rom. 8:9,23). But this explanation of "we have the mind of Christ" is unsatisfactory. As Paul normally used the LXX (55) the fact that the underlying word in Hebrew was רוח would almost certainly have evaded him. Also to say that "having the mind of Christ" refers to the process of renewal of the mind

(cf. Rom. 12:1) brought about by the indwelling Spirit denies the real meaning of ἔχειν . As used by Paul ἔχειν meant a real present possession and not a gradual process.

It seems most satisfactory to conclude that "we have the mind of Christ" refers to the realized eschatalogical fact that God's Spirit has given them a new norm of judgment (νοῦν Χριστοῦ). Thenceforward their total attitude to God and everyday living has been re-orientated by their acceptance of the gospel. What R. Bultmann says of the term νοῦς supports our explanation of νοῦν Χριστοῦ :

> "By it is meant not the mind or the intellect as a special faculty, but the knowing, understanding, and judging which belongs to a man as man and determines what attitude he adopts". (56)

Paul is not referring to the Spirit's continuing work of renewing the Christian's mind, but as the context of verses 14 to 16 clearly indicates, to the Christian's new point of reference, the knowledge of Christ, from which he judges all things. In this verse (2:16) Paul calls this new point of reference "the mind of Christ."

Before summarizing the pneumatology of 1 Cor. 2:10-16 it is necessary to say two things. First, more will be said about the Spirit's somatic indwelling in Chapters Six and Seven. Second, the "high" concept of the Spirit adduced in this chapter, which is based mainly on 2:11, is consistent with what Paul is trying to say to the Corinthians elsewhere in the letter and it provides a basis for his further comments

about the Spirit and spiritual gifts, particularly in 1 Cor. 12-14. We now conclude with a brief summary of this Chapter.

Those Christians at Corinth who had been influenced by gnostic ideas were overemphasising "wisdom" at the expense of Christ and him crucified, and also overemphasising the possession of spiritual gifts. Christ was being forgotten by these "Spiritual Ones" who were almost equating the Spirit with their own human abilities. Against this pride, Paul declared firmly that Christ is the true wisdom of God and that the Spirit is God's Spirit, God Himself. He emphasised the transcendence of the immanent Spirit of God. He recalled them to the past, to the origins of their church, to the Spirit given and the gospel of Christ crucified as he had preached it to them. They had no cause for pride, for all they knew of God and Christ was revealed to them by the Spirit. In addition, their spiritual gifts were given by the same Spirit - the Spirit who is God as He reveals Himself within a σῶμα, whether individual or communal. (57)

NOTES ON CHAPTER 5

1. It is quite clear that Paul's emphasis on the past is purposeful and not incidental to what he is saying to the Corinthians. His intention is to recall them to the earliest Christian tradition and first experience of the power and wisdom of God in Corinth - his first mission there. It is unlikely that his use of the past tense only refers to their baptisms, particularly because of his words in 1: 14-17. It is also unlikely that his intention was to emphasise the realized eschatological aspects of their faith (see 4: 8-10).

2. "The Influence of Circumstance On the Use of Eschatological Terms", J T S April 1964, p. 7.

3. Loc. cit., p. 10.

4. (a) The Christian leaders: J. Calvin, 1 Cor., p. 64.
   (b) All Christians: E.-B. Allo, 1 Cor., p. 45; C. K. Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 76; J. Moffatt, 1 Cor. p. 30; L. Morris, 1 Cor. p. 58; R. Parry (Gk), 1 Cor. p. 56; G. Simon, 1 Cor. p. 69.
   (c) Paul himself: F. Godet, 1 Cor., p. 147.

5. The use of the first person plural in 1 Corinthians: It is true that every "we" passage could refer to Paul and the apostolic leaders only. This is clearly the case where he contrasts himself and the other leaders

with "you" - 3:9; 4:10; (9:4-6); 9:11,12; 15:11,14,15 (possibly 15:19,32-34). Yet there are occasions, especially where traditional teaching is referred to, when "we" almost certainly includes all the Corinthians as well: 8:1,4,(6?); 10:16,17; 12:13. But it is significant that most doubtful passages, such as 1:18; 6:14; 11:31,32; 15:51,57, are concerned with eternal salvation. In these Paul would also undoubtedly include all Christians (although sometimes regarding himself as an example).

But the passage in question is not only concerned with a special gift to preachers, but also with the contrast of all Christians with (even) the leaders of this age. He most probably uses himself and the other apostles as examples of mature Christians using their particular gift (preaching) effectively. For a contrary view, see J. J. Kijne, "We, Us and Our in 1 and II Corinthians", Novum Testamentum, Vol. 8, April - Oct., 1966, pp. 171-179.

6. Nestle is probably correct in preferring γάρ (p^{46}B 69 1739 al C1) even though the majority of textual authorities have δέ (ℵ A DG pm) given a "C" preference by the U. B. S. text.

7. The origin of this quotation is uncertain. If it is a free rendering of Is. 64:4, with "those who love him" added, then Paul is clearly emphasising the need for love. See J. Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 30 ff. for more details.

8. 1 Cor., p. 18.

9. The majority of better MSS omit αὐτοῦ , but a few add it (א D G 33 pl).

10. Some of the times that have been suggested are: (1) when the Gospel entered the world (T. C. Edwards, Robertson and Plummer);
(2) at baptism (R. Bultmann).
(3) Paul's conversion (F. Godet).
But it is better to regard the time of receiving the Spirit as the total conversion - initiation event. For use of this term "conversion - initiation" see J. D. G. Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, pp. 6,7.

11. W. Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God, p. 22.

12. Some good MSS have ἐνοικῶν e.g. B, D instead of ἐνοικοῦντος which is given a "C" preference by the U.B.S. text.

13. See R. Bultmann T.N.T., Vol. I, p. 166 and the section on Gnosticism in Chapter Three (p.35).

14. Judith 8: 14 (LXX) is very similar, cf. also Jer. 17:9,10. The idea of God searching the heart is also found in 1 Sam. 16:7, 1Chr. 28:9, Ps. 139:23, Rom. 8:27.

15. 1 Cor., p. 45.

16. Verse 11 shows that it is not simply a personification.

17. See the section entitled "The Spirit and Christ" in Chapter 6, pp. 118-128.

18. Op. cit., p. 45.

19. Das Werk des Geistes in der Heiligung bei Paulus, p. 487.

20. Of the twenty seven references to the Spirit of God in Romans, only two are πνεῦμα (τοῦ) θεοῦ , nineteen are πνεῦμα and six πνεῦμα ἅγιον . In 2 Corinthians πνεῦμα (τοῦ) θεοῦ is used only once in ten references to the Spirit of God. Πνεῦμα (τοῦ) θεοῦ is not used in Paul's other letters.

21. Héring suggests that in 2:11 ἀνθρώπων could be deleted with A 33 but this textual evidence is too scant. Although the accepted text is awkward Greek it is not impossible but meaningful. It is likely that Paul included the ἀνθρώπων so as not to exclude the idea of God knowing a man's thoughts when he is emphasising that the human spirit cannot know another man's thoughts.

22. So E.-B. Allo, 1 Cor., p. 46, E. Schweizer, Spirit of God, pp. 85, 86.

23. J. Calvin, C. K. Barrett, H. L. Goudge, F. W. Grosheide, J. Héring, J. Moffatt.

24. 1 Cor., p. 74.

25. 1 Thess. 4:8 is the other possibility. For further discussion see W. Pfister Das Leben im Geist nach Paulus, pp. 15-17.

26. E T 27, 1915-16, p.15. He notes the same line of argument in Judith (8:14), the comparison of man with God, the searching of God and the linguistic parallels.

27. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 188.

28. Davies also points out that, in this regard, Paul was consistent with the Rabbinic literature of his day. Thus he says "When Paul, therefore, thinks of the Holy Spirit as concerned exclusively with man he is being true to the Rabbinic outlook of his upbringing and is as far as possible removed from any Stoic conception of a πνεῦμα that penetrates the cosmos." (Op. cit., p.190).

29. T.N.T., Vol. I, p.192.

30. The Body, p.31.

31. Op. cit., p.195.

32. Op. cit., p.194.

33. "Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Cor. 15.", Interp, Vol.21, Jan. 1967, No. 1, p. 21.

34. Spirit of God, p.84.

35. For example: R. Bultmann T.N.T., Vol. I, p.206, E. Schweizer, op. cit., p.85.

36. Theological Wordbook of the New Testament, (Ed.) A. Richardson, p.234.

37. T.N.T., Vol.I, P.206.

38. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p.185.

39. Op. cit., p.207.

40. Loc. cit.

41. Das Werk des Geistes in der Heiligung bei Paulus, p.487.

42. "The Kerygma of Galatians", Interp, April 1967, pp.131-146.

43. Kyrios und Pneuma, p. 141. By placing much emphasis on the difficult Spirit/Christ verses (2Cor. 3: 17,18, 1 Cor. 15:45 - in a similar way to N. Q. Hamilton) he says that "the Spirit is put at the disposal of the Lord as a possibility of his activity" (p. 140) and that "Christ is always thought of as the Spirit-Power who is effective and present only through the Spirit and as the Spirit." (p. 141).

44. But see Chapter 8 for a better interpretation of this verse. The Spirit's relationship with Christ is more fully discussed in Chapter 6.

45. For example E.-B. Allo.

46. So H. L. Goudge, 1 Cor., p. 18. Also for those who regard Paul as teaching that baptism gives the Holy Spirit.

47. So E.-B. Allo, 1 Cor., p. 46, L. Morris, 1 Cor., p. 58.

48. An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek, p. 72.

49. Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich, p. 272.

50. Op. cit., p. 97.

51. Loc. cit., p. 97.

52. For a full discussion of all the possibilities see E.-B. Allo, 1 Cor., p. 47. The following regard πνευματικοῖς as neuter: F. W. Grosheide (1 Cor., p.278), J. Moffatt (1 Cor., p. 177), R. Parry (1 Cor., p. 57). As masculine: E.-B. Allo (1 Cor., p. 47), J. Héring (1 Cor., p. 20), J. C. Hurd (op. cit., p. 194), J. Lias (1 Cor. (E), p. 43).

53. But not meaning unaccountable to anyone for his actions.

54. Though κυρίου is fairly well attested (B D^{+} G it), it is best regarded as an assimilation from the preceding quotation (as E.-B. Allo, 1 Cor., p. 49). Χριστοῦ is better attested and is read by Nestle-Aland, U.B.S. texts and the main English translations.

55. E. Ellis has noted thirteen cases where Paul seems to agree with the LXX against the Hebrew (Paul's use of the Old Testament, pp. 150-152) and W. D. Davies comments "Paul, who had been taught by Gamaliel, apparently preferred the LXX to the Hebrew text" (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 6).

56. T.N.T., Vol. I, p. 211.

57. The Spirit's indwelling will be dealt with in more detail in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER 6

THE PRESENT INDWELLING OF THE SPIRIT

It is our purpose in this chapter to consider Paul's statements in 1 Corinthians about the present activity and indwelling of the Spirit, with particular reference to 3:16, 6:11, 6:19 and 7:40. In so doing, we will discuss the concept of the "temple" as used by Paul in our letter. This leads us to consider the nature of God's presence within the believer, then to the Spirit's relationship with the risen Lord and finally to a consideration of ethics.

It has already been noted that most of what Paul says about the Spirit in 1 Corinthians refers to the Spirit's past activities rather than to His present indwelling.(1) Similarly, it is possible to consider 2:10-16 and 12:1-13 as referring basically, if not wholly, to the initial preaching-conversion events in Corinth rather than referring to the continuing presence and activity of the Spirit.

Paul assumed that the Corinthians were well acquainted with the idea that the Spirit indwells the believer (3:16, 6:19). He knew that they were over-conscious of the spectacular gifts of the Spirit and consequently he emphasised the Spirit's revelatory role. The Spirit, he says, reveals Christ as the mystery and wisdom of God (2:10) by explaining the gospel and its benefits to man (2:12). The Spirit directs the teachers and preachers of the gospel (2:13) and gives all Christians

an ability to discern true values and right judgment (2:13-16, 7:40). The presence of this Spirit, which is truly God's Spirit, brings cleansing (6:11) and makes immoral conduct incongruous in the Christian life (3:16, 6:19). The new age was dawning (2:6-16, 4:20) for the Spirit of God had come, enabling and empowering Christians to confess "Jesus is Lord" (12:3). It is the same Spirit which gives different but communal gifts (12:7-11) to edify the body of Christ and which is Himself the essence of the Church's unity (12:13).

The Temple of God (1 Cor. 3:16 and 2 Cor. 6:16) and the Temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19).

Paul spoke of believers as a temple of God or temple of the Holy Spirit on three occasions in his letters - 1 Cor. 6:19, 3:16 and 2 Cor. 6:16 (but also Ephes. 2:21). Why he used the figure of the "temple" to describe the Spirit's indwelling in 1 Cor. 6:19 only is not easy to determine (in 2 Cor. 6:16 and 1 Cor. 3:16 God is said to indwell). However, we do know that in 1 Corinthians Paul is repeating an expression already known to his readers. (2) We may surmise that this figurative use of "temple" had been misused by the "Spiritual" members of the Corinthian Church to support their overemphasis on the Spirit's indwelling. In any case, in writing his other letters, Paul does not use the figure of the temple to describe the Spirit's indwelling.

In employing the word "temple" it is unfortunate that Paul "does not tell us the source of the statement, but assumes the

Corinthians are familiar with it". (3) Nevertheless, we can be sure that at least some of the Corinthian believers, if not the majority, would have understood the significance of the temple within Judaism. From the Solomonic period up to the exile, the temple in Jerusalem symbolised the presence of God with his people. Thus R. E. Clements can say of this period:

> "The entire ideology of the Jerusalem temple centred in the belief that, as his chosen dwelling-place, Yahweh's presence was to be found in it, and that from there he revealed his will and poured out his blessing upon his people." (4)

However, the belief that the temple was God's dwelling place, even only in theophanies, diminished with the Deuteronomist's theology of the divine name and the exilic emphasis by Ezekiel on "Yahweh's glory as the mode of his presence". (5) But alongside the idea of God dwelling in the temple, the concept of the Almighty God not dwelling in a temple built with hands continued and developed. Thus the post-exilic Jewish community began to have "a deepening sense of spiritual communion with God in the present, <u>apart from the temple</u>" (6) (my underlining) which was usually understood in terms of the Spirit. It appears then, that to some Jews in this period, temple and Spirit were mutually exclusive concepts. (7) That is, although the majority of Jews considered that God dwelt with His people in His temple, a few rejected this view and believed that God dwelt amongst His people in a spiritual way by His Spirit.

The intertestamental period was marked by a common belief amongst the Jews that the Spirit had departed from Israel. W. D. Davies comments:

> "we may assume that Paul was reared within a Judaism which, to use very moderate language, tended to relegate the activity of the Holy Spirit to the past. We now point out, however, that it was also a Judaism which cherished a strong expectation of the coming of the Holy Spirit in the future." (8)

Thus one important strand of Jewish eschatological hopes looked for the age of the Spirit when the Spirit-filled Messiah would come and the temple would be restored. (9)

Because of the existence of Herod's temple, the New Testament period (up until 70 A.D.) was marked by a renewed interest in the temple and a restoration of much of its significance. For Judaism and many other religions of the New Testament period a ναός was a place where the deity was thought to dwell. In addition, with regard to terminology, O. Michel can say that in both Biblical and non-Biblical Greek of the period " ναός (νηός) is, then, the dwelling of the deity." (10)

The reviving of the old conflict between temple and Spirit provided a basis for the Jews to misunderstand Jesus' words "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (Jn. 2:19) and Stephen's "Yet the Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands" (Acts 7:48). It is probable that both Jesus and Stephen regarded their bodies as temples where

the Holy Spirit dwelt. In both Biblical (except perhaps for Eph. 2:21 and 1 and 2 Corinthians) and non-Biblical literature of the New Testament period the metaphoric use of "temple" was restricted in its reference to individuals. In this literature the individual, not the community, is the temple of God. (11)

Paul, however, not only used the individualistic metaphorical use of "temple" employed by Jesus and Stephen but also reverted to the communal interpretation latent in the exilic and post-exilic prophets. Thus he explained what he meant by calling the Corinthians the temple of God (2 Cor. 6:16) by quoting Ezek. 37:27 (slightly modified by conflation with Leviticus 26:11f.):

> "I will live in them and move among them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people."

It is clear from this verse (2 Cor. 6:16) that in calling believers the temple of God Paul meant that God dwelt among and within His people. The promise of Ezekiel had been fulfilled. Thus 2 Cor. 6:16 indicates that the Jewish concept of the Divine Presence"in the apocalyptic notion of a new or renewed temple" (12) lies behind Paul's use of ναός in 1 Corinthians rather than Stoic anthropomorphic ideas. "This eschatological temple the church is, and the sign, or mode, of the Divine Presence (my underlining) within it is the Spirit of God." (13) Here, as in 1 Cor. 3:16, "temple of God" refers to the Church corporately but where "temple of the Holy Spirit" is used in 1 Cor. 6:19 it refers to the individual believer. This usage is consistent with Paul's primary understanding of the

Spirit as indwelling the individual believer rather than the Church. We shall now consider 1 Cor. 6:19 in more detail.

Obviously the implications of being a "temple of God" had been forgotten or had failed to register in the thinking of the Christians at Corinth. This may have been because the pagan temples of Corinth were known for their cult prostitutes (cf. 1 Cor. 6:16) and this would therefore militate against the Christian insistence on ethical holiness.(14) In the verses prior to 6:19 Paul has been at pains to emphasise that, as believers, they belong to Christ, body (6:15) and Spirit (6:17). However, because of gnostic influences or eschatological thinking as expressed in 4:8-10, some of the Corinthian Christians were living immorally and others were indifferent to moral standards. Thus Paul reminds them that such action is incompatible with the knowledge that they are a temple of God in which God's Holy Spirit dwells.

Clearly in 6:19 the Spirit is said to indwell the individual believer. Also, as we have noticed elsewhere,(15) this indwelling is within a human σῶμα. As is characteristic of Paul's terminology with the Spirit (e.g. 7:40) he says that the Corinthians "have" (ἔχετε) the Spirit. Ἔχειν, like the verbs δίδωμι and λαμβάνειν (e.g. Rom. 5:5, 1 Cor. 2:12, Gal. 3:2), indicates that a new relationship has been established with God, complete from the divine side. But although man's response is never complete Paul does not use expressions such as "increase of the Spirit" or "be filled with the Spirit"(16) which may suggest that the Spirit could be given again to a believer

either partially or quantitatively. In his other letters Paul mainly speaks of the Spirit as being received by and indwelling the individual believer rather than the Christian community as a whole. His characteristic use of σαρξ with Spirit also demonstrates (17) that the primary sense of what is meant by the Spirit's indwelling is the individual believer's experience of reconciliation and justification. Thus, as we now turn to 3:16, it is important to notice that the individual indwelling rather than the corporate indwelling is primary in Paul's teaching about the Spirit.

The opening words of 1 Cor. 3:16, "Do you not know", indicate that the Christians in Corinth should have known that they were a temple of God. Paul hardly had to remind them that the Spirit dwelt amongst them but he did have to remind them that the Spirit is God's Spirit and consequently that the Spirit is God's presence with them.

It is possible that Paul may be saying in 3:16 that God dwells amongst them as a group, and individually by the Spirit. (18) But, as he is attempting to emphasise God's activity, it is more likely that "and that God's Spirit dwells in you?" should be regarded as explanatory of the first part of the sentence. The emphasis on God, so evident elsewhere in 1 Corinthians Chapters 1 to 4, is also apparent in 3:16 and 17. The word θεός is used five times in these two verses, four of which are in the genitive case suggesting emphasis. As he says "God's temple is holy", (3:17), verse 16 seems an obvious place to use Holy Spirit rather than God's Spirit, (19) but

for the fact that he was trying to emphasise God's activity. Thus in 1 Cor. 3:16 at least, "temple of God" is used by Paul to emphasise that the indwelling Spirit is not an emanation from God or simply a human possession but the actual presence of the Almighty Creator Himself within and among His people. In addition, although the word σῶμα is not used in 3:16, 17 yet it underlies the verses in the corporate sense (as in 12:12-27) and perhaps also in the individual sense.

We conclude this section on the "temple" by noting two clear similarities to 2:10ff. with regard to Paul's thinking about the Spirit. First, the Spirit is again spoken of as "one" with God. That Paul closely unites the Spirit with God in 3:16 and 6:19 again indicates that the Spirit is regarded as God's presence rather than as a separate power or being. Second, the presence of God, His Spirit, is again spoken of in relation to a σῶμα - in 6:19 the individual σῶμα and 3:16 probably the corporate σῶμα.

The Spirit and Christ

Recent investigations into Paul's understanding of the Holy Spirit [20] have stressed the intimate relationship between the Spirit and Christ. The first subheading in the first chapter of N. Q. Hamilton's study, for example, is entitled "Christology the key to pneumatology", and the first text he deals with in any detail is the notorious 2 Corinthians 3:17. He concludes this section with "the Spirit mediates the presence of the Lord. Thus from the standpoint of faith the Spirit and the Lord are

identical." (21) Writing in similar vein, D. Hill says:

> "The Spirit is the ever-present power and influence of the Christ-event, the impact on men of Christ freed from the confines of past history." (22)

But here he distinguishes the historical actions of Christ ("Christ-event") being made ever-present from the idea that the person of Christ is made ever-present. Although these two concepts are similar they differ considerably in that the latter concerns the transmission of knowledge whereas the former concerns the immediacy of a person.

In the light of these studies it is now imperative that the relationship between the Spirit and Christ in 1 Corinthians be examined more carefully. 1 Cor. 6:11 and 12:1-13 will be considered first.

1 Cor. 6:11 (23) The compactness of Paul's style in this verse makes it difficult to draw many conclusions about the relationship of Christ to the Spirit in the verse. As the statements which immediately precede 6:11 (i.e. 6:9,10) and those that follow (6:12,13) share the same repetitive, poetic and emotive style, it seems unlikely that 6:11 is derived from a creedal statement of any kind. Paul contrasts their old way of life and its consequences with their situation as Christians resulting from their conversion-initiation experience. Rather than attempting to specify the precise application of the three aorist verbs (ἀπελούσασθε, ἡγιάσθητε, ἐδικαιώθητε) (24) or the activities of Christ and the Spirit, it is better to see them all as highlighting different aspects of the one conversion-

initiation event. Although baptising is part of this event, Paul is not here concerned with the rite itself [25] but rather with the spiritual realities which underly the conversion-initiation experience. Thus J. D. G. Dunn is justified when he comments on this verse:

> "We may not assume that when Christians in the NT are recalled to the beginning of their Christian lives the reference is therefore to their baptism. Conversion-initiation was a much richer and fuller <u>experience</u> than the ritual act, and simply to refer all aorists which occur in such contexts to 'baptism' is quite unjustified." [26]

The Spirit's close relationship with the Divine Name (particularly in the Old Testament) [27] and the parallelism between the two phrases ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν show that Paul is here emphasising that the Lord and the Spirit complemented each other's work in the conversion-initiation events. In contrast to the "Spiritual Ones", Paul indicates that God, Christ and the Spirit were active in these events and not just the Spirit. Thus Paul reminds his readers not to separate, in their understanding of salvation-history, the Spirit of God from God or from God's wisdom and power, Christ.

The use of ἡμῶν with θεοῦ also directs the Corinthians' thinking more to God than to the Spirit and places the Spirit's role within the overall sphere of God's activity. Earlier in the letter Paul had more explicitly described the roles of Christ and the Spirit within the Divine plan. The historic Christ, the wisdom and power of God (1:24), had been revealed by God through the Spirit (2:10) and had become their righteousness, sanctification and redemption (1:30).

Paul clearly found no ontological problem in grouping the Spirit, Christ and God together and thus he seems to suggest an affinity of nature as well as operation. However, whilst this same grouping is found elsewhere in his writings, for example, 12:4-6, 2 Cor. 13:14, Rom. 8:9-11, Rom. 15:30, Paul's statements about Christ, the Spirit and God tend to centre on functional rather than ontological relationships.

1 Cor. 12:1-13 (28) By continuing to relate the Spirit to Christ as the revealer of Christ's Lordship (12:3), Paul again turns the Corinthians' thinking away from regarding the Spirit simply as the giver of miraculous gifts. As in 6:11, Paul again places the Spirit's work within the whole Divine economy (12:6 "the same God who inspires (29) them all in every one") together with the authority of Christ the Lord (12:5 "but the same Lord"). While Paul agreed with the Corinthians that the Spirit's indwelling produced in them the various spiritual gifts, he listed these gifts in 12:8-10 in a significant way. When compared with similar lists elsewhere (12:28, 12:29,30, Rom. 12:6-8, Eph. 4:11) this list in 1 Corinthians is noticeably different. (30) Not only are the first three gifts mentioned of the non-spectacular variety (λόγος σοφίας , λόγος γνώσεως , πίστις)but they are also concerned with revelation and therefore with Christ, the sophia of God. By using λόγος , σοφία and γνῶσις rather than ἀπόστολοι , προφῆται and διδάσκαλοι Paul may have been discouraging the glossalalia emphasis at Corinth with the purpose of further stressing the Spirit-Christ relationship.

It is probably true to say that on every occasion that Paul mentions the Spirit in 1 Corinthians he immediately connects Him with Christ. (31) But the triadic statements (6:11, 12:3-6) not only relate the Spirit to Christ, but also re-emphasise the unity between the Spirit and God.

It has already been established (1 Cor. 2:10ff.) that Paul thinks of the Spirit as God Himself acting in and upon individual Christians and the corporate body, the Church. He is, in fact, God's presence within the Christian community (3:16, 6:19 etc.). We are again reminded of this unity between God and the Spirit in 1 Corinthians Chapter Twelve. The Spirit gives spiritual gifts yet God inspires them all in every one (12:6), and God adjusts the body (12:24) and appoints the different ministries (12:28, also 12:18). I. Hermann states well the necessary unity between God and the Spirit:

> "Every aspect of the pneuma concept is confronted by the central statement 'The pneuma emanates from God and belongs to Him' - no matter how the content of the pneuma concept is understood in detail." (32)

Although Paul mostly uses the title "Lord" in 1 Corinthians to refer to the risen Christ yet he does also occasionally use the title "Christ" to speak of the present reign of Christ (for example, 7:22,23, 8:12). Normally, however, the word "Christ" in 1 Corinthians either refers to the historic gospel preached (1:23, 2:2, 9:21) or has some relation to the historic life, death or resurrection of Jesus (for example 11:1, 15:3, 12).

Following our discussion of the title "Christ" (below) and a general discussion of the Spirit's relationship with Christ, the Lordship of Christ and the title "Lord" (κύριος) will be further considered.

When we consider Paul's use of the title "Christ" (33) in 1 Corinthians it appears that he used it mostly to speak of the historic person of Christ and not as a word referring to the mystical union of believers with Christ. That is, "Christ" refers either to the actual content of the gospel preached (34) or, particularly in the ἐν Χριστῷ type of phrase, to the fact that "believers are in Christ; salvation is in Christ." (35) To say that "believers are in Christ" is to describe the benefits of and the characteristics of the new life of believers rather than the <u>experiential</u> aspect of being united with Christ. For example, they are "sanctified in Christ Jesus" (1:2), given grace and "enriched in him" (1:4,5) and are "babes in Christ" (3:1). (36) The experiential aspect of the believer's union with Christ is normally expressed by the concept of the indwelling Spirit rather than by the concept of <u>Christ</u> indwelling. In contrast to the many uses by Paul of the idea of the Spirit indwelling or "in" believers, "Christ" being said to indwell or be "in" believers is rare in the N.T. (37) and not found at all in 1 Corinthians. Similarly, although Paul quite commonly spoke of the Spirit indwelling the heart (καρδία), which was regarded as "the centre of the inner life of man", (38) he does not say that Christ indwells the heart. (39)

That Paul always thought of the Lord as "at a distance" rather than "within" seems consistent with his own accounts of

the Damascus Road experience as well as with those recorded by Luke. (40) 1 Cor. 15:8 indicates clearly that he thought of his vision of Christ as a genuine resurrection appearance and not merely an encounter with a spirit or the product of a psychic experience. (41) Also, H. J. Schoeps is most certainly correct when he says that "to dissolve his (Paul's) experience at Damascus by psychological means is foolishness." (42) So also in Gal. 1:16 (God "was pleased to reveal his Son to me ... I did not confer with flesh and blood") his claim is that he received his apostleship directly from Christ himself and not through human agencies. Certainly Christ had a spiritual body of one kind or another, but Paul's own accounts of his vision give no justification for saying that he believed Christ had become a spirit or the Spirit. They do not suggest an identity between the risen Christ and the Spirit (or spirit) nor do they imply a continuing presence of Christ on Earth.

That Paul never appealed to the Lord for any new commands or new teaching when the Lord had left no explicit teaching on certain matters (for example, some aspects of marriage - 1 Cor:7) supports the view that he considered that he had no <u>immediate</u> contact with the Lord. (43) He gave his own judgment on these matters (see 1 Cor. 7:8,10,25) as a believer having the mind of Christ (2:16) and under the guidance of the Spirit (7:40). Therefore it seems correct to conclude that Paul did not believe that he could receive any new information from the risen Lord. The Spirit's revelatory activity in relation to the risen Lord (as shown in 2:10ff.) is limited to revealing the words and actions of the historic Christ and, in the light of these words

and actions, to interpreting the new circumstances. The Spirit's work is to categorise the new situation so that any thought or action to be pursued may be in accord with what is known of the historic person of Christ. (44)

Based on the Pauline epistles, N. Q. Hamilton and I. Hermann have put forward a thorough Christological understanding of the Spirit. A fairly typical expression of this Christological view follows (though not necessarily identical with that of Hamilton or Hermann): When Christ was raised from the dead to a position of honour and power (Rom. 1:4, Phil. 2:5ff.), he was given a kingdom (45) (1 Cor. 15:27). But the giver of authority and power, who "put all things in subjection under his feet" was God. In addition, possession of a kingdom demanded the ability to exercise power and control over it. This power God made available in His Spirit, the Spirit of God. Through the Spirit, the exalted Messiah rules his kingdom (15:45). (46) Thus I. Hermann says:

> "The Spirit is put at the disposal of the Lord as a possibility of activity" (47) and "it can be shown for the whole of Paul's theology that Christ is always thought of as the Spirit-Power who is effective and present only through the Spirit and as the Spirit." (48)

The Messianic age of the Spirit had dawned in which Christ, now freed from the confines of space and time (15:45), exercises his Lordship through the Spirit. The Spirit recalls and reveals the significance of the historic life and saving death and resurrection of Christ (2:10) empowering Christian

preachers to preach (2:4,5) and exhort (7:40). The Spirit also exercises Christ's Lordship in the giving of spiritual charisma (12:4-11). Thus, according to this christological view, there is a type of "functional" identity between Christ and the Spirit in that the Spirit carries out the work and purpose of the risen Lord in his kingdom.

While this christological understanding of the Spirit may lie behind Paul's words in 1 Corinthians, it is not clearly evident in the letter. Such an understanding would demand a very close relationship between the risen Lord and the Spirit in our letter. However, what is clearly missing from 1 Corinthians is any statement by Paul that the Lord operates <u>through</u> the Spirit. In addition, most of what Paul says about the Spirit in 1 Corinthians is in the past tense and not related to the risen Lord's past or present activities, but instead to the gospel preached (2:4). The Spirit is closely identified with the revealing of the historic Christ-event (2:10ff.) rather than with the exalted Lord's reign over his kingdom.

The risen exalted Lord is truly liberated from the confines of space and time for he rules his kingdom as a life-giving spirit (15:45). However Paul, in our letter, does not speak directly of this Lordship being exercised through the Spirit but instead through his servants and apostles (1:1, 3:23, 4:1, 7:22,23, 16:10) who by faith have responded to the preaching of the historic Christ-event in "Spirit and power" (2:1-5). In consequence, the power of God

made available to the risen Christ is God's presence and power with His people. Paul in 1 Corinthians probably does not indicate that the Lord operates directly in the world, as may be suggested by 5:4, 11:32 or 15:25 but only through the operation of God's power (15:25-28). E. Schweizer describes this power of God -

> "It is identical with the exalted Lord once this Lord is considered, not in Himself, but in His work towards the community." (49)

Thus, Paul (in 1 Corinthians) does not identify the spiritual risen Lord with the Spirit in being, but instead, only in some aspects of their functions and activities. But even this identity is never complete. Consequently N. Q. Hamilton can rightly refer to their functions and activities and say "that from the standpoint of faith the Spirit and the Lord are identical." (50) But, as has been stated, this is not the emphasis in our letter. For while the exalted Lord is able to transcend the limitations of space and time in his heavenly pneuma existence, he nevertheless is still spoken of by Paul as "at a distance", the Lord who will come. By contrast he speaks of the Spirit as God's presence within man who in nature is the transcendent Spirit of the Almighty Creator God (2:10ff.). That is, while the Lord is spoken of as "at a distance", the Spirit is referred to as "indwelling". A similar point is made by R. F. Boyd when commenting on Rom. 8:26,27:

> "The Holy Spirit, then, exercises his function as Intercessor <u>within</u> the Christian, while Jesus 'ever lives to make intercession' <u>in heaven</u>." (51)

The risen Lord operates through the power of God (5:4). The power of God is a broader concept than the Spirit of God. Thus, it was the power of God and not the Spirit which, Paul says, raised Christ from the dead (6:14, 15:15, Rom. 8:11).(52) In addition, Paul never says that Christ sent the Spirit.(53) This would also conflict with his emphasis in 1 Corinthians on the Spirit's origin in God and oneness with God (2:10,11, 6:19). Again, Paul never directs prayer to the Spirit. This may be because he consistently describes the Spirit as indwelling and experiential and this may have resulted in him regarding the Spirit as inappropriate as the subject of prayer, for prayer is normally directed to "one" beyond oneself. However, it is not possible to completely systematise Paul's statements about the relationship of the Lord with the Spirit in 1 Corinthians. All we have attempted above is to determine his emphasis.

The Spirit and Ethics

In 1 Corinthians Paul lays very considerable emphasis on the Lordship of Christ. The Lordship of Christ is continually kept before the eyes of the Corinthian Christians from the opening words of 1 Corinthians where Paul reminds his readers that "our Lord Jesus Christ" is "both their Lord and ours" (1:2), consistently throughout the letter, (54) to the closing words - "If any man has no love for the Lord, let him be accursed. Our Lord come! The grace of the Lord Jesus be with you." (16:22,23). The significance of the title Kyrios as applied to Christ by Paul and by the Early Church is very much bound up with the resurrection and parousia. This is well expressed by L. Cerfaux:

> "There is normally a connection between Kyrios and the resurrection and parousia. The resurrection is the Messias' enthronement as Christ or messianic king. Christ is exalted to God's right hand; he is the sovereign whose solemn entrance we are awaiting. Kyrios in this connection denotes the royal dignity which belongs henceforward to Christ." (55)

The fact that our letter regularly refers to the Lord's parousia (56) indicates that Christ is regarded as bodily "at a distance". He is the Lord who will come. Thus, the aspect of Christ's Lordship that Paul particularly reminds his readers of is Christ's role as judge when he returns. The theme of judgment is very strong throughout our letter, for example - 3:15, 4:3-5, 4:19-21, 5:3-5, 5:6-13, 6:1-8, 9:24-27, 10:1-13, 11:27-33, 16:22. In many of these references the parousia is referred to directly (e.g. 3:15, 4:5, 5:5, 11:32, 16:22) and most also refer to Christ's Lordship (4:4, 19; 5:4, 11:32, 16:22). Hence one of the main ethical motivations that Paul places before his readers is that the Lord will return as judge. J. G. Gager also notices this ethical use of the parousia by Paul. He says:

> "In 1 Cor. 6:9f. and Gal. 5:21, reference to the end is used as a big stick to support Paul's view of what specific moral rules or virtues are consistent with living in the Spirit." (57)

Similarly R. Schnackenburg can say of the early missionary preaching generally:

> "It is, however, remarkable what a significant rôle the concept of judgement played in missionary preaching to the gentiles." (58)

Hence, in our letter, Paul does not direct his readers to follow the Spirit or live by the Spirit or use the Spirit's power in the moral struggle, but to obey the Lord and to imitate his life (11:1) for he will return as judge.

It follows then, that although Christ's Lordship gains much of its significance from the resurrection and parousia, at the practical level in the letter, it is in the sphere of moral and ethical conduct that this Lordship mainly operates. Thus W. Kramer says of Paul's use of the title κύριος:

> "Paul uses the title most frequently in ethical instruction or when dealing with actual conduct or with practical problems in general ... The Lord is the authority to whom men are accountable for their every decision." (59)

Because of the strong and continued judicial emphasis in the letter alongside continued references to the parousia, it seems likely that every use of κύριος in the letter has judicial and ethical overtones. (60)

The ethical principles which Paul gives in 1 Corinthians are, where possible, an appeal to the words and traditions of the Lord (e.g. 7:10,25). Thus M. S. Enslin says:

> "Those words of Jesus that were known to Paul were of the utmost importance and were used by him to point his warnings, but after all they were but fragmentary." (61)

As far as possible Paul used the Apostolic traditions incorporating the words and works of Jesus as the basis of his

gospel (15:3). Where we can find no evidence that the actual words of Jesus lay behind Paul's words it is quite unnecessary to postulate special revelations to Paul. (62) "Paul felt that since he had the mind of Christ his words were really Christ's own words, that Christ was speaking through him." (63) Thus he says in 7:25 "Now concerning the unmarried, I have no command of the Lord, but I give my opinion as one who by the Lord's mercy is trustworthy" and completes the section with "And I think that I have the Spirit of God." (7:40, cf. 2:16). The Spirit gave no new commands from the risen Lord but revealed the significance of the words and actions of the historic Jesus.

We have noticed that in 1 Corinthians Paul mostly speaks about the Spirit as if His work were already completed. (64) But 3:16, 6:19 and 7:40 (and probably 12:1ff.) indicate clearly that when 1 Corinthians was written Paul did think of the Spirit as indwelling the individual believer and also the corporate group, the Church. But even in these verses the Spirit is not spoken of as an active power subduing the flesh (compare Gal. 5:17ff. or Rom. 8:13) or assisting weakness (compare Rom. 8:26), but as the revealer of God's mind and wisdom. In 6:19 and to a lesser extent 3:16, Paul's motive for speaking about the "temple of God" and about the presence of the Holy Spirit is not to explain that there is a conflict between the flesh and Spirit within the believer (as in Gal. 5: 16, 17) but to emphasise an <u>incongruity</u>. He means something like this: "God's Spirit is within you so act in accordance with this knowledge." Thus even in these two verses the

incongruity arises because the Spirit is God's Spirit rather than because the Spirit is regarded as an ethically holy Spirit. (65) It is therefore surprising that in a letter such as 1 Corinthians where so much is said about the Spirit that Paul does not say that the Spirit motivates and empowers right ethical living.

A cursory glance at 1 Corinthians clearly indicates the importance of ethics in the letter. This is particularly the case in 1 Cor. 5 - 11 but also in the other chapters of the letter as well. (66) However the Spirit is only mentioned on three occasions in 1 Cor. 5 - 11, two of which (7:40 and 6:11) are not directly concerned with the ethical problems involved and the third (6:19), as has been mentioned above, does not refer to any active role of the Spirit within the believer in the ethical struggle. A number of motives for right ethical behaviour are given, such as "being risen with Christ" (6:14), being "members of Christ" (6:15), warnings such as "the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (6:9), the prospect of judgment and the parousia (4:5, 5:5), exhortations to imitate the life of Christ (11:1) and follow the Lord's injunctions (7:10). Yet Paul does not say in 1 Corinthians "follow the Spirit", or that Christians are led by the Spirit, nor does he speak clearly of the Spirit/flesh struggle within the believer. Rather, his ethical teaching and exhortations are orientated towards the return of Christ in judgment. Thus this "vertical" type of ethics contrasts strongly with the "horizontal" process of growth in Christian maturity through suffering, resurrection and glorification found in his other letters. (67)

The fact that Paul hardly relates the Spirit to ethics in 1 Corinthians (and also in the Thessalonian correspondence) has been explained by some scholars as being a result of his belief in the imminence of the parousia. They have said that when this imminent hope faded Paul began to think more and more of the horizontal progress in Christian living (e.g. Rom. 8) and to emphasise the Spirit's role in this progress. (68) However if, as seems most likely, the eschatological expectation found in 1 Corinthians is not an imminent expectation but rather, in R. Schnackenburg's words, a "perpetual expectation" (69) then another answer must be found for the lack of ethical content in the Spirit concept of 1 Corinthians.

Before the answer to this question is pursued further, it must be noticed that it has also been contended by some scholars that the traditional idea of sanctification as an ethical progress towards the likeness of Christ empowered by the Spirit is absent from this letter. This view seems to be supported by Paul's use of ἁγιάζειν (1:2, 6:11 and 7:14) and ἁγιασμός (1:30) in the letter where they both refer to a past event rather than to a continuing process. (70) Thus N. Q. Hamilton, commenting on Paul's letters generally, can say: "The Christian is already sanctified (ἡγιάσθητε, 1 Cor. 6:11)." But although Hamilton continues and says: "The thing has been done to him and for him as a work of the Spirit (ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, ibid: ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ Rom. 15:16)", (71) Paul himself certainly does not say this of the Spirit in 1 Corinthians. For in 1 Corinthians the concept of the Spirit is noticeably absent from the main ethical teaching of the letter.

In conclusion, the key problem that has been raised throughout this discussion of the relationship between the Spirit and ethics in 1 Corinthians has been Paul's failure to relate the Spirit to ethics. A number of solutions have been proposed. First, it has been suggested that Paul's belief in the imminence of the parousia resulted in a vertical type of ethical thinking dominated by the expectation of the Lord's coming in judgment, which neglected the more long-term concept of ethical progress and struggle so well described elsewhere by Paul in terms of flesh and Spirit. While there seems to be evidence for this view, there is an even greater likelihood that Paul did not think that the parousia of Christ was imminent. Also, there is sufficient evidence in the letter to indicate that Paul, at this stage, did encourage the more horizontal type of ethical progress in "imitatio Christi". For example, the Corinthians' amoral behaviour called forth much ethical exhortation from Paul (1 Cor. 5-11) for he saw them as babes in Christ (3:1ff.) needing teaching on many aspects of Christian living. He called on them to imitate himself as he imitated Christ (11:1) and he contrasted the realities of his own life (4: 9-13) with their exalted claims (4:8,9).

Second, it has been suggested that Paul's theology developed and, in regard to the Spirit, that the Spirit is more and more ethicised in his later writings. However, the letter does give indications of this later emphasis, for example the Spirit/flesh contrast obviously underlies 3:1 - "But I, brethren, could not address you as spiritual men, but

as men of the flesh" (σαρκίνους). This view also raises acute questions of chronology that are not easy to solve.

Third, (and most likely) the circumstances in Corinth most probably demanded a particular approach by Paul in writing his letter. As a missionary writer, being "all things to all men", Paul spoke little about the indwelling experience of the Spirit because of overemphasis by the "Spiritual Ones" on possession of the Spirit and their neglect of the Lordship of Christ. This resulted in Paul stressing the Lord's κύριος role as judge of moral conduct who would return in judgment. Thus, most of the "Spirit" statements refer to the past and not to His present indwelling and activity in the ethical struggle. In consequence, the Pauline concept of the Spirit active within the believer, opposing the flesh, assisting in weakness and motivating ethical behaviour is virtually absent from 1 Corinthians.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 6

1. See pp. 74-76.

2. E. Evans, 1 Cor., p. 87, J. C. Hurd, op. cit., p. 237.

3. O. Michel, TWNT, Vol. 4, p. 886. As Paul uses the "temple" concept to motivate holiness of living, it is unlikely that any other temple or temples in general is meant by his usage, rather than the Jerusalem temple.

4. God and Temple, p. 76.

5. R. E. Clements, op. cit., p. 137.

6. R. E. Clements, op. cit., p. 138. See Is. 66:1,2, 57:15 and compare Acts 7:47-50, and Hebrews 11 (where the temple is not mentioned).

7. But this does not mean that the whole post-exilic community thought this way. Haggai 1,2 and Ezekiel 47:1-12 are examples in which the eschatological hope of God dwelling with His people is integrated with temple and Spirit.

8. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 215.

9. The precise nature of messianic and eschatological hopes of Jews in the N.T. period remains a matter for debate

and further investigation.

10. TWNT, Vol. 4, p. 880. This is observable in the later Jewish books such as Isaiah 28:16 ff., I Enoch 91:13 and Jubilees 1:17. When Paul used ναός metaphorically he thought of it as the inner sanctuary of the temple, the place where God's presence dwelt.

11. TWNT, Vol. 4, p. 886, n. 25, "neither in Stoicism nor Philo do we find the idea that the temple of God is the community."

12. C. K. Barrett, I Cor., p. 90.

13. C. K. Barrett, loc. cit., p. 90.

14. "According to Strabo VIII, 6, 20 there were over a thousand temple prostitutes at the Temple of Aphrodite" in Corinth. Quoted by R. Schnackenburg, The Moral Teaching of the New Testament, pp.274,275.

15. See pp. 91, 92, 102.

16. Even if Eph. 5:18 were Pauline the ethical content of the verse and the obvious contrast of "be filled with the Spirit" with "do not be filled with wine" seems sufficient to explain this usage as not conflicting with the normal Pauline view of the Spirit.

17. For example, Rom. 5:5, 8:27, 9:1 and 2, 2 Cor. 1:22, Gal. 4:6. "Thus the heart is supremely the one centre in man to which God turns, in which the religious life is rooted, which determines moral conduct." J. Behm, TWNT, Vol. 3, p. 612.

18. E.-B. Allo, 1 Cor., p. 63, "C'est parce que l'âme qui vit en charité possède le Saint-Esprit que la communauté entière est un temple de Dieu, comme ensemble des 'membres du Christ'."

19. However the sense of the verses is reasonably clear. Paul could have left out almost every use of θεός in vv. 16,17 and written: "Do you not know that you are a temple and that the Spirit dwells in you? If any one destroys the temple, God will destroy him. For the temple is holy and that temple you are."

20. For example, I. Hermann, Kyrios und Pneuma, N. Q. Hamilton, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, K. Stalder, Das Werk des Geistes in Der Heiligung bei Paulus, W. Pfister, Das Leben im Geist nach Paulus.

21. Op. cit., p. 15. I. Hermann means the same: "therefore the functioning of the Pneuma and the Kyrios represents for the believer one and the same event." (op. cit., p. 140).

22. Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, p. 279.

23. This verse is further considered in Chapter 7, pp.165,166.

24. The three verbs refer both to Christ and to the Spirit.

25. ἀπελούσασθε describes a spiritual cleansing and moral change of life contrasting with 5:1 -6:10, rather than washing with water in baptism, "although it may be implied that water-baptism was the occasion when this cleansing took place." (J. D. G. Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, p. 121.) ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ need have no direct reference to baptism particularly as it was used in 5:4 with no direct reference to baptism, i.e., "name" refers to the authority and power of Christ, cf. also 1:2,10.

26. Op. cit., p. 121. For more on baptism, see pp. 159-166.

27. K. Stalder, op. cit., p. 43ff.

28. These verses will be considered further in Chapter 7.

29. The R.S.V. translation of ἐνεργῶν by "inspires" is rather weak. C. K. Barrett's "operates" is far better (1 Cor., p. 281).

30. The other lists are basically the same as 1 Cor. 12:28, particularly the first three gifts - ἀπόστολοι, προφῆται, διδάσκαλοι.

31. So, 2:4, 2:10-16, 6:11, 6:17-19, 12:1-13, 15:45. 3:16 does not seem to be an exception as Christ is the foundation of the temple (3:11); 7:40 is concerned with the continuing Lordship of Christ (cf. 7:10,25).

32. Op. cit., p. 143.

33. This includes such variations as Christ Jesus, Jesus Christ and the Lord Jesus Christ.

34. For example, 1 Cor. 15:12ff., 2:2, 1:23. W. Kramer (Christ, Lord, Son of God, p. 49) commenting on the relationship between "believing" and the names "Christ" and "Jesus" in Paul's letters says: "Christ (Jesus) is the object of faith in the sense that his death and resurrection form the substance of the kerygma, and because the kerygma awakens faith, the content of the kerygma is also the content of faith."

35. E. Best, One Body in Christ, p. 29.

36. Other examples of the phrase "in Christ" or its cognates in 1 Corinthians are 4:10,15,17; 7:39; 15:18,22,31; 16:24.

37. The only Pauline occurrences are Rom. 8:10, Gal. 2:20 (Eph. 3:17).

38. TWNT, Vol. 3, p. 611.

39. But "and that Christ may dwell in your hearts" (Eph. 3:17).

40. We accept that Paul thought of the risen Lord as in some sense spatially distant and not just temporally or eschatologically distant.

41. Paul's own account must take precedence over Acts (so J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, J. Munck, Paul, p. 79). But as Knox points out, "The one thing - and the only thing - Paul says about the experience is that he saw the Lord; (my underlining) and this Acts not only does not say but all but excludes." Op. cit., p. 116.

42. Paul, p. 279.

43. In addition, in all Paul's letters his prayers are directed to God or Christ and never to the Spirit (see Col. 1:9ff., 1 Thess. 1:2ff., 2 Thess. 2:13ff.).

44. I. Hermann's "pneuma is therefore the christological category of realisation" (op. cit., p. 142) is similar but depends upon a different concept of the relationship between Christ and the Spirit.

45. The Kingdom of God is to be identified with the Kingdom of Christ (against O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, pp.11,12) - see R. Schnackenburg, God's Rule and Kingdom, p. 297). See also pp. 54-56.

46. This verse is considered in detail in Chapter 8.

47. Op. cit., p. 140. Also R. Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 351.

48. Op. cit., p. 141.

49. TWNT, Vol. 6, p. 433.

50. Op. cit., p. 15. W. D. Davies (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 223) remains cautious: "for Paul the Risen Christ was closely associated if not identified with the Spirit."

51. Interp 8 (1954) p. 40.

52. We cannot agree with N. Q. Hamilton when he says, with reference to 6:14, that this verse "implies directly" that the Spirit was the agent of Christ's resurrection. (Op. cit., p. 14).

53. In the ἐν Χριστῷ type of formulation (1 Cor. 15:22) Christ is probably regarded as a being incorporating all the new believing community. Thus Paul seems to regard the risen Lord in terms of human σῶμα and human πνεῦμα. However, although the risen Christ is spoken of in this way he can and does transcend the normal limitations of space and time, both bodily (10:16, 12:27) and spiritually (6:17).

The expression "Spirit of (Jesus) Christ" or "Spirit of the Lord" is rare in Paul's writings (Rom. 8:9, 2 Cor. 3:17 cf. 18, Phil. 1:19) and does not occur in 1 Corinthians. The reason for this expression not occurring in 1 Corinthians is probably that Paul's main desire here was to relate the Spirit to God and to the gospel of Christ which he had preached. Thus he relates the Spirit to the historic Christ in our letter more than to the risen Lord. The fact that Paul nowhere explicitly reflects the Gospels' idea of Christ as the messianic bearer of the Spirit may also have some connection with his use of the expression "Spirit of Christ".

2 Cor. 3:17,18 is instructive, for a number of commentators (for example E. Schweizer, Spirit of God, p. 60) have rightly pointed out that these two verses in 2 Corinthians and particularly the expression "Spirit of the Lord" not only do not identify the Spirit and the Lord but actually support the non-identification of Spirit and Lord. If Spirit and Lord are to be identified then the genitival connection in 2 Cor. 3:17 becomes meaningless. What Paul appears to be doing in these verses is trying to overcome a confusion in the minds of the Corinthians. By his linking of Spirit and Lord he is saying that the operation of the Spirit spoken of in vv. 1-16 corresponds to the ministry of the new covenant under the Lordship of Christ of which Paul himself is a minister. Thus Paul's purpose is not ontological but to explain the ministry of the new covenant in the Spirit.

54. For example, 1:7-10; 4:1ff.; 5:4,5; 6:11,13ff., 7:10, 17,22,25.

55. Christ in the Theology of St. Paul, p. 465.

56. Other references to the parousia are 1:7 and 8, 4:5, 5:5, 7:29-31, 11:26, 15:23 ff., 16:22.

57. "Functional Diversity in Paul's Use of End-Time Language," JBL 89, Part 3, (Sept. 1970), p. 336.

58. The Moral Teaching of the New Testament, p. 301.

59. Christ, Lord, Son of God, p. 181.

60. However W. Kramer adds a cautionary note when he says "simply to transfer to the Kyrios-concept as a whole the connection which exists between the Mare-Kyrios and the parousia is to go too far." Op. cit., p. 175.

61. The Ethics of Paul, p. 116.

62. Paul's words "I did not receive it (the gospel) from man" (Gal. 1:12) do not mean that he did not use the Apostolic traditions. Similarly M. S. Enslin, op. cit., p. 113.

63. M. S. Enslin, op. cit., p. 108. Marcel Simon ("The Apostolic Decree and Its Setting in the Ancient Church",

BJRL, Vol. 52, Spring 1970, No. 2, p. 454) suggests: "'And I think also that I have the Spirit of God' (7:40) may well appear as a direct reply to the (Apostolic) Decree which is placed by the Twelve under the authority of the Holy Spirit. 'It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us.'"

64. See pp. 74-76.

65. However the word "holy", in Biblical usage, carries with it a moral connotation. But when Paul uses "Holy" with "Spirit", his emphasis is usually on the godly origin of the Spirit rather than ethical holiness. C. R. Pinnock says "It (the word "holy") underlines the tremendous majesty of God. Yet although the ethical nuance is not obviously present in most occurrences it does on occasion come to the surface." (The Concept of Spirit in the Epistles of Paul, p. 111). W. Pfister places a little more emphasis on the ethical aspect but also regards ἅγιος when used with πνεῦμα, as closely connected with the Spirit's godly origin (Das Leben im Geist nach Paulus, p. 9).

66. For example 3:3; 4:6; 13; 15:33; 16:13,14.

67. For example 2 Cor. 4, Phil. 3:13,14 and Rom. 8.

68. V. P. Furnish argues strongly against this view (Theology and Ethics in Paul, p. 276).

69. The Church in the New Testament, p. 122f. Some of the reasons for preferring the idea of "perpetual" rather than "imminent" expectation are as follows: (i) 1 Cor.6:14 suggests that Paul thought that he may die before the parousia; (ii) there is little evidence of any crisis caused by a "delay" of the parousia; (iii) there is little lessening of eschatological tension throughout the Pauline corpus; (iv) the continued reference to the parousia in our letter seems to be more for ethical reasons than because of its imminence. For a fuller discussion of eschatology see ~~the section in~~ Chapter 9 entitled "The Spirit and Eschatology".

70. The word ἁγιάζειν is rare in Paul's writings. He only uses it five times (and once in Ephesians) and of these, three are in our letter (1:2, 6:11 and 7:14 - 7:14 may be omitted in this discussion as its sense in context is quite different). In 1:2 ἁγιάζειν is used in the aorist tense indicating that it does not refer to a continuing process but to God's action in calling them to be a separate people (similarly Allo, Barrett, Calvin, Goudge, Héring and Moffatt). This understanding of ἁγιάζειν is also true of 6:11.

The one occurrence of ἁγιασμός in 1 Corinthians (1:30) also has no suggestion of a continuing process (so also Barrett, Calvin, Goudge, Héring). The word in 1:30 does not refer to a work within the sinner but to an act of righteousness for him whereby he is forgiven and consecrated to God.

71. The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, p. 39.

CHAPTER 7

1 CORINTHIANS 12 - 14

Introduction

The purpose of this section is to find out what Paul says about the Spirit in 1 Corinthians 12-14 rather than to describe the "gifts of the Spirit". That is, we will be concerned with the Spirit's relationship to spiritual gifts and to baptising and we will also be attempting a fairly detailed examination of 1 Corinthians 12. 1 Corinthians 12-14 forms a unit in the letter for it is concerned with spiritual gifts and in particular with the problems which had resulted from the presence within the congregation of members who could speak in tongues.

It is generally agreed (1) that the opening words of 1 Corinthians 12, περὶ δὲ , probably indicate that Paul is answering a question the Corinthians had asked him. In the light of the use of περὶ δὲ in 1 Corinthians J. C. Hurd suggests that some of the matters they asked him about in a letter were these:

> "How is it possible to test for the spirit? How can we (or anyone else) distinguish between spiritual men? When you were with us and spoke with tongues you gave us no instruction on this point." (2)

The imaginative reconstruction of these problems by Hurd may reflect the kind of problem that Paul wished to answer, but

whether it faithfully reveals the Corinthians' intent remains uncertain.

Paul's references to the Spirit, his use of the words πνευματικῶν , λαλεῖν , νήπιοι (13:11 cf. 14:20), πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ , and his emphasis on unity in 1 Cor. 12-14 indicate that the section is closely related to 2:10 - 3:9 where these same words are used and the same problems underlie his words. It has already been suggested that Paul's explanation of the Spirit's nature and activity in 1 Cor. 2:10-16 is a preparation for this section on spiritual gifts. (3) That is, only when the Spirit is regarded truly as God's Spirit, God's presence within a human σῶμα revealing the wisdom and power of God, will the spiritual gifts be seen in their right perspective.

Although Paul in 1 Cor. 12 deals with the spiritual gifts in a general way, it is quite clear that the problem of division caused by the possession by some Corinthians of the gift of "tongues" is his chief concern. This is also evident in the "Hymn to Love" (13:1,8) where Paul attempted to instil a right attitude of love into both those who possessed the gift of tongues and those who did not. In 1 Cor. 13 he shows the need for valuing the person more highly than the gift itself. Paul displays this same attitude of love in his cushioning of his criticism of the "Spiritual Ones" when he says to them all, "Now I want you all to speak in tongues" (14:5) and "do not forbid speaking in tongues" (14:39). (4)

1 Cor. 12:1-3

It is quite apparent that many aspects of the Corinthians' background and present circumstances impinge directly on these verses. Paul recalls that as Gentiles they had previously worshipped dumb idols (v. 2) and had been carried away emotionally into ecstatic experiences (v. 2). His references to "knowledge" (ἀγνοεῖν, οἴδατε, γνωρίζω), "speaking" (ἄγωνα, λαλῶν, λέγει, εἰπεῖν) and "spiritual ones" (or "gifts" - πνευματικῶν) (5) indicate that he has the gnostic(6) spirit enthusiasts at Corinth in mind. It is also clear that matters concerning the Spirit, gifts of the Spirit, baptismal confession, tests for the Spirit, disunity and tongue-speaking are involved. But the essence of the subject matter of vv. 1-3 and vv. 4-13 is the Spirit and spiritual gifts and more specifically what it means for a person to be described as ἐν πνεύματι.

The reasons for regarding the expression ἐν πνεύματι as vital for a true understanding of these verses are as follows: first, Paul uses the expression five times in thirteen verses. He also sees fit to modify the expression thoughtfully throughout the section. One group of variations concerns the terminology used of the Spirit (πνεύματι θεοῦ, πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, πνεύματι). The other group of variations concerns the use of the word ἐν (διά, κατά (7) then back to ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ and ἐν τῷ ἑνί). These two kinds of modification probably indicate that Paul wanted to say something not only about πνεῦμα but also about the preposition used with πνεῦμα. That is, with reference to the Spirit's activity, he seems to

be discouraging the sole use of ἐν with πνεῦμα for the use of a greater diversity of prepositions.

Second, ἐν πνεύματι was a very suitable phrase for gnostic spirit enthusiasts to use. (8) Although we cannot be certain that the Corinthian enthusiasts did use the expression, the likelihood that they did is considerable. As we have already seen, Paul regarded the Corinthians' terminology as important (for example 8:1,3) and he himself chose his words carefully when speaking of the Spirit. (9)

These considerations lead us to conclude not only that Paul wished to give tests for the Spirit's presence, to emphasise the unity between the Spirit, Christ and God and to encourage unity through diversity of gifts amongst the believers at Corinth, but also that his use of the expression ἐν πνεύματι was motivated by the possibility that it was used by the "Spiritual Ones" to refer to their ecstatic experiences.

From the first use of the expression ἐν πνεύματι (θεοῦ) in verse 3, where the Spirit seems to be contrasted with dumb idols (v. 2), through to v. 11, the <u>activity</u> of the Spirit is in mind. (10) This suggests that the ἐν in the expression in vv. 3-11 should probably mean "by", (11) indicating activity, rather than "in the sphere of." Thus ἐν πνεύματι in vv. 1-11 refers to the Spirit's influence and activity upon the individual believer. Consistent with Paul's normal use of πνεῦμα for Spirit of God, ἐν πνεύματι does not appear to have a

corporate sense. This is indicated by Paul's need to use σῶμα in v. 12 ff. to emphasise the corporate nature of the believing community. We now consider vv. 1-3 in more detail.

That the immediate motive for Paul's words in vv. 1-3 was a problem concerned with "tongue" speaking is clear from his recalling of the Corinthians' ecstatic past (ἤγεσθε ἀπαγόμενοι, and εἴδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα)(12), his continued reference to "speaking" in verse 3 (λαλῶν λέγει, δύναται εἰπεῖν) and his opening words Περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν . His use of the expression "I do not want you to be ignorant" (v. 1) (13) and the verb γνωρίζω indicate the importance and the newness of what he wants to say.

In general terms, Paul in verse 3 is giving his readers tests for the Spirit's presence and activity. That he felt it necessary to do so indicates that those who spoke in tongues probably regarded this gift as the only true manifestation of the Spirit. Consequently they probably considered that they alone were speaking ἐν πνεύματι . But it cannot be determined with certainty whether " ΑΝΑΘΕΜΑ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ had been uttered within the congregation by a member claiming to be speaking by the Spirit (14) or whether Paul's choice of words indicated some Jewish opposition. (15) However, the crucial teaching of vv. 1-3 is that a person's ability to speak ecstatically does not in itself guarantee that he is speaking ἐν πνεύματι . For Paul has shown clearly that the Spirit reveals Christ as the power and wisdom of God (1:24, 2:10 ff.) and consequently

that the Spirit of God could never say "anathema Jesus." However the Corinthians' own pagan background, in which ecstatic speech was not uncommon, should have reminded them that, in itself, speaking in tongues was no guarantee of the Spirit of God's influence.

Having established that no one indwelt by the Spirit of God could renounce Jesus, Paul goes one important step further in verse 3b. What he means here is that even if a person can speak in tongues and does not curse Jesus, this is still no proof that he is speaking under the influence of the Spirit. He maintains that, quite independent of possessing spiritual charismata, if a person can truly confess "Jesus is Lord" then he is doing so under the Spirit's influence, he is truly speaking ἐν πνεύματι and is truly πνευματικός. By recalling their baptismal confession he asserts that true profession and nothing else demonstrates the Spirit's presence. But Paul's chief concern in vv. 1-3 was not to give tests for the Spirit's presence but to weld the believers at Corinth into a united Church. He indicates to the πνευματικοί that those who cannot speak in tongues are also under the influence of God's Spirit if they confess Jesus as Lord.

1 Cor. 12:4-11

Paul's main teaching in these verses is that the spiritual gifts which believers receive are very varied yet it is the same Spirit (vv. 4,8,9,11) who gives these quite different charismata. He does not seem to be motivated by a concern that the Corinthians

may be drawn away by other spirits but he reinforces his contention that all believers share a common faith, a common Lord and God and a common Spirit (12:13). In addition, he appears to imply that the Spirit always manifests [16] Himself charismatically (v.7). [17] J. Héring is judicious when he says:

> "The variety of gifts, on which he so insists, seems to indicate moreover that the Christian does not receive the Holy Spirit <u>in abstracto</u>, but always in the form of a specific aptitude which he should put at the Church's disposal." [18]

The fact that Paul placed the gift of tongues and the gift of interpretation of tongues at the end of the list is probably another indication that some of the Corinthians valued these gifts too highly. [19]

The grouping of Spirit, Lord and God together in vv. 4-6 (as in 6:11) is, as C. K. Barrett says, "the more impressive because it seems to be artless and unconscious." [20] I. Hermann [21] and R. Schnackenburg [22] regard the activity of the Spirit in vv. 4-11 as identical with that of the risen Lord. But in 1 Cor. 12, rather than emphasising a Spirit-Lord unity, Paul again succeeds in closely identifying the Spirit's activities with the activities of God. He says the Spirit gives the χαρίσματα (v. 8) and then that God appoints the various ministries (v. 28). God inspires the gifts in every one (v. 6) and also the Spirit inspires them (v. 11). The Spirit distributes the gifts "as he wills" (v. 11) and God

arranged the organs in the body "as he chose" (v. 18). Paul again seems to be consciously reminding his readers that the Spirit which has been active within their community is truly God Himself. In using a verb of willing (βούλεται , v. 11) of the Spirit he indicates that he does not regard the Spirit simply as an impersonal power of God, but in a real sense "personal". (23)

1 Cor. 12:13

Before considering the variety of interpretations of this verse a number of observations should first be made. Whereas the previous section, vv. 4-12, has been in the present tense, the verbs of 12:13 are aorist. This use of the present tense in vv. 4-12 is probably related to the fact that these verses are less personal and more theoretical than 12:13. This is also observable in the use of "we" (24) in 12:13 in contrast to "each" (ἑκάστῳ) and "other" (ἄλλῳ and ἑτέρῳ) in vv. 4-12. In addition, the mention of Jew or Greek, slave or free, not only indicates that "this baptism had displaced the solidarities of race and class" (25) but also may reflect the variety in composition of the Church in Corinth in its earliest days (see also 12:3). These considerations, along with Paul's use of the past tense with the Spirit elsewhere in the letter, indicate that he is probably referring to an historic event in 12:13.

There are close links in expression and purpose between 12:12, 13 and 10:1-5. The following words are common to both - βαπτίζειν , πάντες , ὁ Χριστός , πίνειν , as well as the

parallels ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ with ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, and εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν with εἰς ἓν σῶμα. In addition, the purpose of both 12:13 and 10:1-5 is to emphasise that all the members of the congregation in question shared the same spiritual opportunities. Although the common terminology may be the result of normal baptismal usage, the use of πίνειν in both places and their common purpose suggest that 12:13 should be linked with 10:1-5 to understand it adequately. We notice that 10:1-5 also has an historical event as its basis. Verse 13 will now be considered in more detail.

As the activity of the Spirit has been in mind throughout vv. 1-10, it seems that the ἐν with πνεύματι (as in these verses) could be taken as instrumental,[26] but the close parallelism of the verse with 10:1-5 suggests that it is better regarded as local (as ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ).[27] This understanding of ἐν πνεύματι in this verse is supported by J. D. G. Dunn's claim that "In the NT ἐν with βαπτίζειν never designates the one who performs the baptism."[28] By using the words ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι Paul reminds his readers that individually they had heard and responded to the gospel preached in Spirit and power (2:4) so that they all received the one Spirit of God but they also received varying charismata (12:4-10). But the Spirit did not leave them as individual believers. Not only were the new converts drawn together because the charismata were communal in nature (12:7, 14-31), but the Spirit also brought them to share a common spiritual experience (12:3) and to owe allegiance to the same Lord (12:5) and to the same God

(12:6). The outworking of this communal desire and common obedience was baptism in water. Thus baptism, as obedience to the Lord's command, signified a concrete identification of the believer with Christ and with the believing community ("one body"). Just as Paul used the Exodus events of passing through the sea as a "type" of Christian baptism, so being baptised is used by him (12:13) as a "type", illustrating their common conversion experience. It appears that Paul did not have a theology of baptism in his mind when he wrote these words (29) but rather that, by recalling this concrete event in their Christian experience, he used it as a teaching aid to illustrate the basic unity of the Christian community. (30) As in 10:1-5, where "baptising" is closely linked with "into Moses" (v.3), so in 12:13 ἐβαπτίσθημεν is intimately linked with εἰς ἓν σῶμα. That is, being baptised (31) means baptism into a group. (32)

The view given here is supported by J. D. G. Dunn who decisively rejects the possibility of εἰς meaning "'in', 'for (the sake of)', or 'with a view to'" and rightly insists that εἰς in Paul always "has the basic sense of 'motion towards or into' some goal." (33) Dunn quite rightly opposes the view that Paul in 12:13 speaks of two stages of Christian experience - first, a conversion experience and baptism in water, followed later by a second stage, baptism in the Spirit. He says:

> "For Paul, to become a Christian and to become a member of the body of Christ are synonymous ... there is no alternative to the conclusion that the baptism in the

> Spirit is what made the Corinthians members of the body of Christ, that is Christians." (34)

However Dunn seems to take no account of the fact that the expression "body of Christ" is not used in 12:12 or 13. What Paul says is "so it is with Christ" (ὁ Χριστός) and "we were all baptised into one body." Even if "body" here does mean the "body of Christ", and this is doubtful, Dunn assumes that the "body of Christ" is a spiritual reality rather than an expression which describes the community of believers at Corinth. Paul's first use of the expression "body of Christ" in 1 Corinthians (12:27) clearly seems to have the members of the church in Corinth in mind rather than simply to mean "Christian". R. P. Shedd comments on this verse: "the emphatic ὑμεῖς and the anarthrous σῶμα denote a specific reference to the Church of Corinth." (35) In addition, Dunn's insistence that 12:13 refers to baptism in the Spirit and his rejection of βαπτίζειν meaning water-baptism are not well founded. We can agree with his words:

> "It is their experience of the Spirit (not of water-baptism) which provides the jumping-off point for Paul's appeal to the Corinthians for a right attitude towards the exercise of spiritual gifts. It is their experience of the <u>one</u> Spirit (not water-baptism) which is the basis of their unity." (36)

Yet this in itself does not deny that water-baptism is being referred to in 12:13. However, his words do support our view above that in 12:13 βαπτίζειν is used in an illustrative and

historical way rather than doctrinally.[37] In addition, the probable historical reference in 12:13, the normal use of βαπτίζειν referring to water-baptism, the non-use of any clear reference to Spirit-baptism in Paul's letters and the close connection with 10:1-5 all suggest that water-baptism is meant.

Verse 13b has been variously interpreted.[38] Augustine, Luther, Calvin and others considered that it referred to the Lord's Supper. However the aorist (ἐποτίσθημεν) refers to a definite occasion rather than to a continuing participation in the Lord's Supper. F. Godet suggests that 13b begins the new thought of diversity. He says:

> "The new fact in the mind of the Apostle seems to me to be the communication of the gifts of the Spirit which accompanied the laying on of hands after baptism."[39]

Except for the fact that Paul does not mention the laying on of hands, Godet's understanding seems basically correct. Baptised into one group, the Corinthians experienced the overwhelming flood of the Spirit[40] (cf. Rom. 5:5), giving them many and varied charismata for the benefit of the whole Christian community. They could look back to this event (cf. 2:4,5) as the work of the one Spirit of God.

The Spirit and Baptism

It is now necessary to bring together the various references to baptism in 1 Corinthians which bear on Paul's understanding of the Spirit. It will not be possible to

consider all aspects of baptism but only those which are immediately relevant.

First, we notice that the noun "baptism" (βαπτισμός,-ά) is not used in 1 Corinthians by Paul and that the verb "to baptise" (βαπτίζειν), used ten times, refers to the historic act itself on eight occasions and only twice (10:2, 12:13) is it used in a positive doctrinal way.(41) On the other hand there are some doctrinal verses which may refer to baptism (e.g., 6:11, 12:3) where the verb βαπτίζειν is not employed.

It appears that the Corinthian Christians laid great store on those who baptised them (1:12-17) in the mistaken view that one baptiser's baptism was superior to that of another. Hence Paul reacts against this view and says: "I am thankful that I baptised none of you except Crispus and Gaius" (v. 14) and "For Christ did not send me to baptise but to preach the gospel" (v. 17). In addition, gnostic influences were probably at work exhibiting a mechanical view of baptism. To them, being baptised probably meant a rite which had given them special abilities and powers.

However, in contrast to the believers in Corinth Paul does not place much emphasis on the rite of baptism itself, but as a missionary he is more concerned with the meaning of baptising in the whole context of preaching and belief. Thus, particularly in 1 Corinthians, but elsewhere too, Paul sees himself primarily as a preacher of the gospel (1 Cor. 1:17) rather than as part of

a cultus or as a sedentary theologian. In the words of R. Schnackenburg,

> "Paul is not a theologian who thinks in terms of liturgy or mysteries. First and foremost he is and remains a preacher of the Gospel: that is his calling." (42)

Thus, most references to baptising in 1 Corinthians recall Paul's early missionary preaching amongst his hearers. He emphasises the preaching and its results rather than the rite of baptism. This point is made by C. K. Barrett when commenting on 1 Cor. 1:16 -

> "It is hard to avoid the conclusion that this verse reveals at least a relative disparagement of baptism." (43)

But this "relative disparagement" must be considered in the light of his own call to preach the gospel and in the light of the possible adverse circumstances existing with regard to baptism in Corinth. (44) Thus Paul continues his missionary stance as he writes 1 Corinthians.

Before considering the Spirit's relationship to baptism it is first necessary to express as succinctly as possible what Paul meant by baptism. For this we must go beyond 1 Corinthians and consider his other letters as well. R. Bultmann's view of Paul's understanding of baptism lies between the extremes of A. Deissmann who emphasises Paul's mysticism and of some Roman Catholic scholars (45) who speak of baptism as <u>ex opere operato</u> in similar fashion to the mysteries. Bultmann says:

> "Baptism is an objective occurrence which happens to the baptized, not simply a symbol for a subjective

> process within him. Whatever inward experiences the one being baptized may have, Paul does not reflect about them. As an event occurring objectively to the baptized, baptism certifies to him participation in the salvation-occurrence, the death and resurrection of Jesus. It, then, makes the salvation-occurrence present for him just as the proclaiming word also does, only this time with special reference to him, the one being baptized, as valid for him. But the appropriation on his part is the same as the appropriation of the salvation-occurrence when it comes through the preached word." (46)

We may accept Bultmann's statement above as a satisfactory starting point for our understanding of Paul's concept of baptism. It expresses well the relationships between the preached word and baptism and also between symbolism and realism in baptism. In addition, it indicates the true objectivity of the rite - "baptism certifies to him participation in the salvation-occurrence." Bultmann, however, considers that Paul did not cast off the mystery concepts of baptism completely, but W. D. Davies is probably correct in his assessment of the lack of such influence. (47)

It is difficult to determine how Paul's thinking on baptism developed (if it did at all) and whether this development is present in his letters. For example, the type of teaching about baptism present in Paul's exhortation to the believers in Rome (Rom. 6:1ff.), that their baptism into Christ meant a uniting

with Christ's death, is not obviously present in 1 Corinthians.[48] It appears that Paul had not received a very full doctrine of baptism from the Early Church, but that he himself used the rite to explain and illustrate his teaching. This is what R. B. Hoyle means when he says:

> "His (Paul's) references to baptism are generally by way of illustration of practical truths which he enjoins on his readers." [49]

Hence, two questions normally asked about the Spirit - whether baptism gives the Spirit and whether the Spirit produces faith - do not seem to have bothered Paul or his readers. They are theoretical questions, whereas the missionary Paul was concerned to give answers to very practical problems. However, we must now consider the former question a little further.

Perhaps Paul could have said that they received the gifts of the Spirit when they were baptised, but for him to say that baptism gives the Spirit seems completely inappropriate. To indicate that the Spirit - God Himself who brooded over the whole missionary endeavour (cf. Gen. 1:2), who empowered the apostles' preaching, produced signs, gave the ability to confess Christ as Lord, the desire for baptism and created a new community possessing the gifts of the Spirit - was given through baptism, seems quite inadequate. To Paul, the Spirit concept was far too broad and lofty to be limited in such a way. K. Stalder expresses this well thus, "baptism has its all inclusive reality in the Spirit" and not the other way around.[50] We cannot therefore agree with R. Bultmann when he says:

> "Paul as a matter of course, shares the general Christian view that the Spirit is conferred by baptism (1 Cor. 6:11; 12:13 ....)." (51)

In none of his writings does Paul ever say that baptism gives the Spirit. Such a view would require a mechanical view of baptism and a depersonalised concept of the Spirit. If Paul did think that baptism gave the Spirit, it is astounding that he did not make a clear statement affirming what would have been such an important doctrinal matter. In addition, the test for the Spirit's presence would have been straight-forward - "are you baptised?" If Paul could say to the Corinthians "I am thankful that I baptised none of you except Crispus and Gaius" (1:14) (even in the context of divisiveness) it seems most unlikely that he thought baptism gave the Spirit. K. Stalder sums up our conclusions well:

> "Often it is asserted that, according to Paul, the Spirit is given with, in or through baptism. We do not find any basis for this assertion." (52)

But Stalder also makes it perfectly clear that Paul does not speak of <u>any</u> direct means of giving the Spirit. (53) Paul does not say that the Spirit is given in or through preaching, baptism, the Lord's Supper, laying on of hands or any other physical or human means. The Spirit associates Himself with and empowers such means when these means declare the Cross of Christ and provoke the hearers or participants to faith in Christ. Where Christ is proclaimed as Lord the Spirit confirms with signs and wonders (1 Cor. 2:4,5) that it is God's truth.

To Paul, baptising, rather than baptism, was one part of the total preaching, hearing, conversion, incorporation-into-the-church process. But he also saw in the rite an opportunity to explain many aspects of his teaching.

It is now necessary to consider the verses in 1 Corinthians which have been claimed to relate the Spirit with baptism. Bultmann (54) refers to two verses only from 1 Corinthians which, he claims, indicate that baptism gives the Spirit: they are 6:11 and 12:13. But, as 12:3 (55) and 12:13 (56) have already been dealt with in some detail only 6:11 will now be further considered.

Although baptism is not specifically mentioned in 6:11, many consider that baptism is the key to its interpretation. (57) However, in a recent study J. D. G. Dunn makes the following comments on this verse -

> "But in fact Paul is not talking about baptism at all - he speaks rather of the great spiritual transformation of conversion which turned the Corinthians' lives inside out and made immoral and impure men into saints, cleansed and justified by the authority and power of God. We may not assume that when Christians in the N T are recalled to the beginning of their Christian lives the reference is therefore to their baptism. Conversion-initiation was a much richer and fuller <u>experience</u> than the ritual act, and simply to refer all aorists which occur in such contexts to 'baptism' is quite unjustified." (58)

Dunn is quite correct in maintaining that although baptism is part of the whole conversion-initiation experience referred to in this verse, it is the Spirit, not water-baptism, which has brought about the washing, sanctifying and justifying. (59) He regards ἀπελούσασθε as a spiritual cleansing rather than washing with baptismal water (60) and ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as referring to Christ's lordship rather than to the specific rite of baptism. (61) Paul contrasts their past moral wrongdoing (6:9-11) with their new life under the lordship of Christ which has resulted from his preaching and from their conversion-initiation experience. This is consistent with Dunn's thesis on the whole of the New Testament -

> "Spirit-baptism and water-baptism remain distinct and even antithetical, the latter being a preparation for the former and the means by which the believer actually reaches out in faith to receive the former." (62)
>
> "A recall to the beginnings of the Christian life in the NT is almost always a recall not to baptism, but to the gift of the Spirit, or to the spiritual transformation his coming effected." (63)

1 Corinthians seems to support the above statements of Dunn on baptism and the Spirit.

The Spirit and the Gift of "Tongues"

It is difficult to determine with certainty what Paul was referring to as γλώσσαις λαλεῖν in 1 Corinthians. This is because there is no precise definition of the expression in 1 Corinthians, and because the information we can gather from our

letter does not completely correspond with the description of a similar phenomenon (ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις) in Acts 2. In addition, S. D. Currie maintains that there is insufficient evidence beyond the N.T. in early Christian and non-Christian writings to determine with precision what speaking in tongues meant. (64)

Speaking in tongues, although not uncommon in pagan religions, cannot be simply regarded as a left-over from the Corinthians' pagan background (65) for Paul clearly says it is a gift of the Spirit (12:10) and that he himself spoke in tongues (14:18). F. Pratt summarises well the main facts about the nature of the phenomenon as recorded in our letter. He says:

> "(1) articulate, intelligible language since it was a prayer, psalm, benediction and thanksgiving (1 Cor. 14:14-16).
> (2) it had a connected meaning since it expressed concepts (14:19 cf.29).
> (3) it was susceptible of interpretation (1 Cor. 14:27 etc).
> (4) was a language which resembled foreign languages (1 Cor 14:21 etc.) and was comparable to the means which men and angels use to communicate thoughts (13:1)." (66)

But F. W. Beare goes beyond the evidence in 1 Corinthians when he says:

> "There can be no doubt, then, that the main purpose of Paul is to discourage the practice of speaking with tongues among Christians." (67)

However, Paul was highly disturbed by the over-emphasis on the gift in the church at Corinth. Consequently, he actively encouraged his readers to see it in its right perspective (68)

and to place less value on it, particularly in comparison with prophecy (14:1-5). As discussed previously, [69] it seems likely that the pneumatikoi possessed the gift of tongues and either exalted it above the other charismata or regarded it as indicating that they alone had the Spirit. J. C. Hurd comments on 1 Cor. 12-14 thus:

> "The three chapters form one long attack upon the notion that speaking in tongues was the single or the best manifestation of the Spirit at work in the Church." [70]

There are suggestions in 1 Cor. 14 that all the Christians at Corinth may have been able to speak in tongues (14:18, 23, 26). [71] However this cannot be clearly sustained from these verses and would be contrary to 14:5 ("Now I want you all to speak in tongues"), to the general understanding of 1 Cor. 12 and to the underlying problems at Corinth. In 14:5 Paul seems to be desiring a situation that does not at present exist. Thus his encouragement of the Corinthian Christians to speak in tongues probably results from the likelihood that some members wanted tongues forbidden in the congregation. [72] What he appears to be thinking is that if they could all speak in tongues then the problems of arrogance, pride (4:19, 12:21) and divisiveness would disappear. However such a solution would probably not overcome their over-emphasis on the gift. While our understanding of 14:5 may seem inconsistent with Paul encouraging a diversity of charismata (12:4-11), a similar criticism could also apply to his attempt to persuade his readers to seek the gift of prophecy. He wants the Corinthian church to

be as fully endowed with charismata as possible (1:7, 14:1), but he also wants his readers to pursue the higher gifts (12:31, 14:1).

Paul's words in 14:5 might seem to imply that all Christians could speak in tongues if they sought the gift. Thus A. Bittlinger can say:

> "In desiring that all prophesy, Paul must have believed that this gift, together with the gift of tongues, is potentially present in every Christian." (73)

But this view looks at the situation from the wrong angle. It is not man but God, as the indwelling Spirit, who distributes the charismata. It is God's desire (according to Paul) to give members of the congregation different gifts. Having different gifts encourages communality and interdependence in love. From God's angle, and man's, there is no possibility of all the congregation attaining the higher gifts. Paul knows that the higher gifts are more difficult to develop and use, and that the natural tendency of man is to be content with charismata which need less effort and require less spiritual perception. The Corinthian Christians seem to have become content with the lower gifts and in particular with speaking in tongues. He therefore exhorts them to seek the higher gifts, for these are of greatest benefit to the congregation.

Thus, there is no indication in any of Paul's letters that he regarded speaking in tongues as a necessary gift. On the contrary, his words in 1 Cor. 12:1-3 show that "tongues" should

not be regarded as the indication of the Spirit's presence. F. W. Beare comes to a similar conclusion:

> "It is perhaps sufficient to note that it ("speaking in tongues") is not regarded by any N T writer as a normal or invariable accompaniment of the life of grace, and there is no justification in the classical documents of the Christian faith for holding it to be a necessary element in the fullest spiritual development of the individual Christian or in the corporate life of the church." (74)

While there are indications that Paul thought the Spirit gave charismata (one or more) to every Christian (e.g. 12:4-11, 14:26) the evidence is not clear enough for us to give a definite affirmative answer. For although charismatic problems are regularly associated with the Spirit in 1 Corinthians (75), this is not normally the case in Paul's other letters.

Above all, the Spirit in 1 Corinthians is the presence of God who gives understanding of the wisdom of God (2:10-16). He is the revealer of Jesus as Christ and Lord (12:3). Although Paul wished to emphasise ἀγάπη (76) to the Corinthians at the expense of their stress on γνῶσις (e.g. 8:1-5, 13, 14:1), he does not clearly relate the Spirit to ἀγάπη . In addition, while the Spirit gives charismata to believers, Paul prefers to emphasise the non-spectacular gifts and the attitudes of faith, hope and love in an attempt to lessen the Corinthians' interest in the more spectacular gifts of the Spirit.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 7

1. E.-B. Allo, 1 Cor., pp. 152-153, J. C. Hurd, op. cit., p. 74, J. Moffatt, 1 Cor., pp. XV-XVI. However C. K. Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 278, rightly indicates that some doubt must remain.

2. Op. cit., p. 208.

3. See pp. 52-54, 101, 102.

4. Paul rarely connects the Spirit explicitly with ἀγάπη (as in Rom. 5:5) but the close relationship between them is implied in the positioning of 1 Cor. 13 between Chapters 12 and 14.

5. It does not seem possible to determine with certainty whether πνευματικῶν is masculine or neuter. Which ever it is the sense is much the same. Lias and Simon consider that πνευματικῶν is best regarded as masculine whereas Calvin, Edwards, Ellicott, Goudge, Grosheide, Héring, Robertson and Plummer consider it to be neuter. Allo, Barrett, Morris and Parry give no clear decision.

6. This term is used simply for convenience and not with the intention of implying that the pneumatikoi were gnostic in the full sense of the word.

7. In the context, there is very little difference in meaning between ἐν , διά and κατά . See p. 81.

8. "The Gnostics represented themselves as 'spiritual' people." (W. C. Van Unnik, Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings, SBT 30, p. 42.)

9. So A. C. Thiselton, op. cit., p. 137.

10. V. 3 - speaking by the Spirit, vv. 8, 9 - giving of gifts through the Spirit, v. 11 - inspired by the Spirit and apportioning as he wills.

11. Robertson and Plummer (1 Cor., p. 261) on ἐν πνεύματι in v. 3 say:
"active influence rather than surrounding element seems to be implied here." Similarly N.E.B., R.S.V., Allo, Héring and Morris. C. K. Barrett and M. Simon prefer to translate "in the Spirit" rather than "by the Spirit".

12. C. K. Barrett comments on the use of ἀπαγόμενοι and ἤγεσθε in 12:2 thus - "It suggests moments of ecstasy experienced in heathen religion, when a human being is (or is believed to be) possessed by a supernatural". For further details and examples see his 1 Cor., pp. 278,279. Similarly, J. Héring (1 Cor., p. 124) comments on 12:2 - "It is very natural that the Apostle should recall here the ecstatic phenomena of a pagan past."

13. Other occurrences of the expression in Paul - Rom. 1:13, 1 Cor. 10:1, 2 Cor. 1:8, 1 Thess. 4:13 - all emphasise the importance of what follows.

14. J. Héring says "We feel that the Apostle would not mention this case unless it really had occurred." (1 Cor., p. 125).

15. This and other possibilities are given more fully by C. K. Barrett, 1 Cor., pp. 279, 280.

16. Robertson and Plummer (1 Cor., p. 264) take φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος as an objective genitive, but the sense of the passage suggests it is probably a subjective genitive - so Godet, 1 Cor., p. 193, "He manifests himself by communicating them".

17. In v. 7 ἑκάστῳ seems to imply that every believer receives a 'gift'.

18. 1 Cor., p. 126.

19. 1 Cor. 14:5 "Now I want (θέλω) you all to speak in tongues, but even more to prophesy," if taken out of context appears to contradict Paul's encouragement of variety in 1 Cor. 12. What he probably means is that, in the short term, if everyone in Corinth spoke in tongues it would overcome the divisions and lack of love. "'Thelo' does not express an order, but a concession in the form of a wish unlikely to be fulfilled (cf. 7:7)" (J. Héring, 1 Cor., p. 146).

20. 1 Cor., p. 284.

21. Op. cit., p. 35.

22. Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul, p. 27. W. Kramer, op. cit., p. 46d opposes this identification of Lord and Spirit.

23. The essence of personality resides chiefly in the will. Whilst the "personality" aspect of the Spirit is not clear in 1 Corinthians, it appears that the Spirit reveals God's person (2:10,11) as understood in Jesus Christ.

24. See p. 77. While "we" in 1 Corinthians normally refers to Paul and the other apostles, "we all" is a clear indication that Paul has the Corinthians very much in mind in 12:13.

25. P. Minear, Images of the Church in the New Testament, p. 191.

26. So Calvin and Goudge.

27. So Barrett, Grosheide, Morris, Robertson and Plummer. Grosheide (1 Cor., p. 293) comments: "Greek: not ὑπό but ἐν because baptism as such is not performed by the Spirit. But baptism is only valid if there is a working of the Spirit."

28. Op. cit., p. 128.

29. That is, either of baptism giving the Spirit or "baptism in the Spirit".

30. This is probably what he is doing in Romans 6 also. Much of the Christian understanding of baptism derives from Paul (cf. G. Wagner, op. cit., n. 128, p. 290). But this does not mean that he consciously worked out a theology of baptism. Rather, the process of baptising suggested itself as an excellent image for illustrating Christian teaching. Similarly G. Wagner, op. cit., pp. 287, 293, 294.

31. Whereas the aorist middle (ἐβαπτίσαντο) in 10:2 may reflect Jewish neophyte baptism - "the Jewish neophyte baptized himself," (Héring, 1 Cor., p. 86) - the change to the aorist passive in 12:13 is far more suitable for a group understanding.

32. It is important to look further at the use of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians, for E. Best (One Body in Christ, n. 2 p. 69) claims:

> "We have no certain evidence that in Pauline, or pre-Pauline, times σῶμα was used to denote a collection or society of men; σῶμα when used of a number always represents the body of a person, but not in the way in which we speak of a group of people as a body."

In most cases in 1 Corinthians σῶμα refers clearly to the human body (e.g., 6:13-16, 7:4,5) but its meaning in

in 10:16,17 and 11:24, 27-29 need further explanation. In 10:17, "Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body", the use of ἓν σῶμα is suggested by the communion setting of the bread and "the body of Christ" (v. 16) and is placed by Paul in parallel with εἷς ἄρτος. As in 12:13, the purpose for using σῶμα is to indicate that unity is of the essence of the congregation although it contains many members.

In 11:24, 27-29 the use of σῶμα is also in the setting of the Lord's Supper. If the use of σῶμα in v. 29 does not simply mean the "element" of bread, then again we have σῶμα suggested by the communion setting and again referring to the congregation of believers. Thus, what is common to both 10:17 and 11:29 is that the use of σῶμα (whatever it means in detail) is suggested by and to be understood from the context and that in both cases this context is the Lord's Supper.

When we consider 12:13, unless ἐποτίσθημεν is evidence to the contrary, the setting is not that of the Lord's Supper. But in common with both 10:17 and 11:27 the use of σῶμα in 13a is suggested by a previous word - in this case πνεῦμα . As in 10:17 and 11:27 ἓν σῶμα is then paralleled with the previous words - ἑνὶ πνεύματι . Therefore, just as the communion setting in 10:17 and 11:27 suggested the use of σῶμα , πνεῦμα does so in 12:13. That is, just as we have seen previously that the Spirit is regarded by Paul as always dwelling within a human σῶμα , this same understanding of the Spirit

suggests the use of σῶμα here (12:13a). Paul is again explaining the Spirit in terms of human nature. As well, the content of σῶμα in 13a is also explained clearly by reference to man's nature (12:12 and 12:14ff.). It is also possible that the use of ὁ Χριστός in 12:12 is intended to infer that the Spirit and the believers are united in Christ himself as the Spirit of Christ indwelling the body of Christ.

Therefore the uses of σῶμα in 10:17, 11:27 and 12:13a are a preparation for a new concept for the Corinthians - "you are the body of Christ" (12:27). In each of the uses of σῶμα in 10:17, 11:27 and 12:13a Paul uses an already known concept (i.e. the Lord's Supper in 10:17, 11:27 and the Spirit in 12:13a) to introduce this new understanding of σῶμα . This is particularly the case in 12:12-27. We conclude that in 12:13a, σῶμα does not quite mean "the body of Christ" but means a group or community, in a more general sense.

12:27 is the first use of the expression "body of Christ" by Paul (as far as we know), therefore it does not seem necessary to accept the views for the meaning of σῶμα in 13a which are dependent on an over-all Pauline theology as in J. A. T. Robinson's The Body or in the "corporate personality" idea (e.g., E. Best, One Body in Christ).

33. Op. cit., p. 128. G. Wagner (op. cit., n. 121, p. 287) provides further evidence to support this view of εἷς .

34. Op. cit., p. 129.

35. Man in Community, p. 161.

36. Op. cit., p. 130.

37. Dunn's other criticisms also do not oppose our view.

38. For example, J. Héring (1 Cor., p. 130) thinks that ἐποτίσθημεν "relates to the actual act of baptism."

39. 1 Cor., p. 211.

40. C. K. Barrett considers that the use of ἐποτίσθημεν has the effect of giving "a somewhat impersonal view of the Spirit" (1 Cor., p. 289).

41. A division of usages of baptism into "historic" and "doctrinal" may seem unreal (and perhaps impossible). However the general purpose in doing so is quite apparent. On many occasions it is the "historic" event itself which is meant in the context rather than a "doctrinal" understanding of baptism. Rightly, of course, the "historic" should be part of the "doctrinal" understanding.

42. Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul, p. 187. See also p. 138.

43. 1 Cor., p. 48. Similarly R. Bultmann, T.N.T., Vol. I,

p. 312. R. Schnackenburg on the other hand considers that Paul was only opposing a false sacramental piety (Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul, p. 182). C. K. Barrett (1 Cor., p. 47) says "it may well be that the convert held in special regard the man who baptized him". Whatever the meaning of the baptismal rite referred to in 1 Cor. 15:29, it indicates an approach to baptism that is probably not found elsewhere in Paul's writings.

44. For a detailed discussion of 15:29 see C. K. Barrett, 1 Cor., pp. 262-264.

45. R. Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 188ff., is not completely satisfactory in this regard.

46. T.N.T., Vol. I, p. 312.

47. Davies says "the attempt to make Paul the κῆρυξ of a new mystery offering a mystic death and rising again has failed." (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 98. See pp. 89-98 also.) G. Wagner goes even further and asserts "that the vocabulary of the mysteries is foreign to the apostle." (op. cit., p. 275).

48. W. E. Wilson (E T, Vol. 42, p. 563, "The Development of Paul's Doctrine of Dying and Rising again with Christ") says, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians contains no reference to this doctrine". However it may be suggested

in 1 Cor. 15:31 and 1 Cor. 6:14, but not associated with baptism. Cf. also G. Wagner, op. cit., n.137, p. 292.

49. The Holy Spirit in St. Paul, p. 158.

50. Das Werke des Geistes in der Heiligung bei Paulus, n. 9, p. 79.

51. T.N.T., Vol. I, p. 333. Similar views to those of Bultmann are held by H. J. Schoeps, Paul, p. 118, and R. Schnackenburg, op. cit., pp. 16, 30. Oepke, TWNT, Vol. I, p. 542, makes no statement one way or the other, similarly R. B. Hoyle, The Holy Spirit in St. Paul, p. 151 ff.

52. Op. cit., p. 79.

53. Op. cit., n. 9, p. 79.

54. T.N.T., Vol. I, p.333.

55. Enough has already been said about this verse to indicate that little can be deduced from it as regards the relationship between baptising and the Spirit. It is the confession "Jesus is Lord" that Paul is considering rather than baptism itself. See pp. 121 ff., 148-152.

56. See pp. 155-159.

57. For example Allo, Edwards, Godet, Goudge, Lias, Robertson and Plummer. Others are more hesitant, such as Barrett and Morris. Héring makes no mention of baptism.

58. Baptism in the Holy Spirit, p. 121.

59. Op. cit., p. 122. The three aorists in this verse all refer to the one conversion-initiation event. The compactness of expression probably does not indicate a creedal or baptismal source. See pp.119-121.

60. Op. cit., p. 121.

61. Op. cit., p. 122, so also 1:10,13. The phrase εἰς τὸ ὄνομα in contemporary literature meant "to the account of": Dunn, op. cit., note 5, p. 117.

62. Op. cit., p. 227.

63. Op. cit., p. 228.

64. He summarises the available early evidence outside the N.T.:

> "1. The evidence available does not permit formulation of a precise description of the phenomena indicated in the N.T. by the phrase glossais lalein.
>
> 2. It cannot be determined, therefore, whether the N.T. phrase can be used appropriately to

describe current "speaking in tongues" phenomena.

3. There are four possible constructions of glossais lalein in the early christian and non-christian writings canvassed for evidence:

a. Speaking a human language one has not learned;

b. Speaking a non-human language;

c. Uttering a "dark saying", more enigmatic than "prophecy" or "revelation" and therefore requiring interpretation;

d. Uttering cadences of vocalization which do not constitute discourse .....

For (a), this study disclosed no early, firsthand account of the use of such a gift by a christian."

"Speaking in Tongues," Interp, Vol. 19, July 1965, ~~no.~~ 3, p. 294.

65. "We are concerned with an ecstatic phenomenon which is shared by both Jewish and Gentile Christianity and for which there are analogies in the religious history of the OT and Judaism." J. Behm, TWNT, Vol. I, p. 724.

66. The Theology of St. Paul, p. 426.

67. "Speaking with Tongues", JBL 83 (3,1964), p. 244.

68. Tongues is placed last in the lists in 12:8-10 and 12:28. As tongues is the main problem involved, the placing of prophecy near the end of the list in 12:8-10 is irrelevant.

"Tongues" is usually followed by an adversitive, e.g. 14:2 cf. 3, 4a cf. 4b, 5a cf. 5b, 18 cf, 19, 39 cf. 40. Paul says to seek the higher gifts, 12:31.

69. See pp. 36-38.

70. Op. cit., p. 192.

71. In 14:18 the πάντων probably means "all of you who speak in tongues"; similarly 14:23. However, πᾶς need not have the all-inclusive sense that "all" has in English. B. Reicke gives some examples: "we read of "all Jerusalem" in Mt. 2:3, "all Judaea" in Mt. 3:5, "all (ὅλη) Syria" and "all (πάντες) the sick" in Mt. 4:24. Here πᾶς is not to be taken strictly. It is simply a popular way of denoting a great number." TWNT, Vol. 5, p. 896. 14:26 probably means that each member of the congregation had some contribution to make. For further discussion of these verses see R. Banks and G. Moon, "Speaking in Tongues", The Churchman, Vol. 80, ~~no.~~ 4, (1966), pp. 287-289.

72. Such a view may lie behind Paul's words, "do not forbid speaking in tongues" (14:39).

73. Gifts and Graces, p. 108.

74. Op. cit., p. 246.

75. 2:4, 2:12, 12-14 but also Gal. 3:5 (?), 1 Thess. 1:5, 5:19 (?), Rom. 15:19.

76. Love is not a charisma in the Pauline sense. Whilst charismata are gifts which vary between Christians, love is necessary for all.

CHAPTER 8

THE SPIRIT AND RESURRECTION (1 COR. 15:45)

Our concern in this section is to investigate the relevance of 1 Cor. 15:45 (and 6:14) to Paul's understanding of the Holy Spirit and therefore, in many respects, our study of 1 Cor. 15 and resurrection itself must remain incomplete. However, resurrection is not simply another important matter treated by Paul, but in the words of K. Barth, "The Resurrection of the Dead is the point from which Paul is speaking and to which he points."(1) In full agreement, J. Héring puts it this way, "The doctrine of the Resurrection is like the keystone of the structure of the Apostle's religious thought." (2)

Even though the letter is seemingly disjointed, (3) all the earlier matters discussed in it anticipate this section on resurrection. J. Calvin suggests three reasons for the placing of such an important subject so late in the letter. Paul had to establish his authority, then subdue the Corinthians' pride and be sure they were at a point where they would be willing to accept his teaching. (4)

Whatever underlying misconceptions there were about resurrection, Paul here speaks of the Apostolic gospel which he had received (vv. 3, 4) and the Apostolic witness (vv. 5-8) to assert clearly the authority and truth of his teaching which was to follow. "Christ had entered into the totality of sin and death and conquered it from within" (5) opening up

the way of life to all believers. Christ, the firstfruits, was the guarantee of a new humanity "in Christ" (v. 22). But if there had been no resurrection then their preaching was in vain (v. 14), they were liars (v. 15), they were all still under God's condemnation because of their sins (v. 17) and were all to be pitied (v. 19).

Of the main suggestions put forward as to the possible error in the Corinthians' thinking about resurrection, (6) the most feasible one is that they denied the resurrection of the body as unspiritual or perhaps as "unscientific". The majority of commentators (7) take this view as it seems to fit the context best. R. McL. Wilson supports this view. He says:

> "The most natural rendering of 1 Cor. 15:12 is not that some say there will be no resurrection (because it is already past), but that in their view there is no such thing. The verb is in the present tense, not the future. In other words, Paul's opponents would be maintaining the 'Greek' view of the immortality of the soul over against a resurrection of the body, as indeed Paul's whole argument seems to imply, with its emphasis on the fact of the resurrection of Jesus." (8)

Hence we can be fairly certain that the error in Corinth regarding resurrection arose because of a gnostic tendency amongst those who were called the "Spiritual Ones". In the light of this, we may be sure that Paul would be particularly careful in his use of πνεῦμα, πνευματικός, and πνευματικῶς in writing this section.

In 6:14 [9], "and God raised the Lord and will also raise us up by his power" (διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ), there may be a conscious steering away from using the phrase "through the Spirit." That is, it appears that Paul does not wish to speak of the activity of the Spirit with regard to resurrection. This contention is supported by the surprising fact that in Paul's longest statement on resurrection no activity of the Spirit is mentioned, nor is the Spirit mentioned as a guarantee. In sharp contrast to these Pauline "omissions" A. Schweitzer could say that Paul regarded the Spirit as "the power which communicates the resurrection mode of existence."
He continues:

> "From the point of view of a deeper understanding, therefore, the dominant force of the situation is that the Spirit is the form of manifestation of the powers of the resurrection. Through their possession of the Spirit believers have the assurance of sharing in the same resurrection with Christ." [10]

We may also compare our letter with Romans (8:11, also 1:4?) where the Spirit is spoken of as an integral agent in the resurrection process, with 2 Corinthians where the Spirit is mentioned twice as a guarantee (1:22 and 5:5, where resurrection is again the subject), or even with the expectation and hope afforded by the Spirit's presence as found in Galatians (4:4-7; 5:5).

In the manner that M. E. Dahl understands resurrection, the certainty of others being resurrected with Christ lies in the eschatological necessity of their inclusion because they

are "in Christ". He says:

> "The redemption which we know to have already taken place in the totality of our nature as it is now, must complete itself in this momentous change." (11)

He denies that this concept is abandoned in 2 Corinthians 5.(12) If he is correct, then we have further grounds for wondering why this certainty is transferred from Christ's resurrection in 1 Corinthians to the Spirit in 2 Corinthians.

Paul leads up to his important statement in 15:45 by contrasting three significant aspects of the present (ψυχικόν) existence with the future resurrection (πνευματικόν) life (vv.42-44). In these verses man's present existence is characterised as φθορά, ἀτιμία, ἀσθένεια and σῶμα whereas the new eschatological existence is characterised by ἀφθαρσία, δόξα, δύναμις and σῶμα πνευματικόν. The obviously close link between πνεῦμα (v. 45) and πνευματικόν makes it imperative to consider how πνευματικός is used elsewhere in the letter and then to determine what the contrast between σῶμα ψυχικόν and σῶμα πνευματικόν means in verse 44. The other uses of πνευματικός in 1 Corinthians will now be considered.

E. Schweizer comments on the general use of πνευματικός and πνευματικά in Paul's letters:

> "It follows from what has just been said that πνευματικά can be the content of the knowledge which is only given through the Spirit of God, that is, heavenly things inaccessible to the νοῦς, in other words the gospel of

> Christ (1 Cor. 2:13, 9:11, Rom. 15:27). In these two last passages, earthly things are subsequently mentioned as carnal (σαρκικά) though without any connotation of evil. They are simply what promotes the natural life but does not unite with God. Thus even ordinary foods and drinks are contrasted with the "spiritual" ones which come directly from God's world and bestow divine power (1 Cor. 10:3). There is no idea here of the elements bearing the Spirit, as is shown by passages using similar language (Note: 1 Pet. 2:5 ... Barn. 16:10 ... Did. 10:3 ... Ign., Eph. 5:1) and also by 1 Cor. 10:4β." (13)

However, there are some commentators who go further than Schweizer and regard Paul's concept of the "spiritual body" as the new body, animated by the Spirit of God. (14) Therefore, in the verses being considered, the question must be asked whether Paul uses the word πνευματικός with or without direct reference to the Spirit or animation by the Spirit.

It is apparent from Paul's use of πνευματικά for "spiritual gifts" (15) that he does not mean that the gift is indwelt or animated by the Spirit. Rather, πνευματικά refers to the totality of spiritual gifts bestowed, and empowered by the Spirit of God.(16) These gifts may also be "spiritual" in the sense that they are the means through which God builds up His Church, but Paul is probably only using it as a "name", with little theological significance other than that already indicated. In addition, it is likely that πνευματικά was a term used by the Corinthians (12:1), which indicates that caution must be exercised in using it in the sense of "spiritual gifts" to

interpret πνευματικόν in our verse (15:44).

This same caution must apply to πνευματικός when meaning "Spiritual Ones". (17) Undoubtedly some Corinthians described themselves in this way and as Paul does not call believers πνευματικοί in any other letter it is likely that he is using it in 1 Corinthians as a point of contact with his opponents at Corinth. He uses it to mean indwelt by the Spirit in 2:15, but is probably redefining, in a true Christian sense, this term which was used in a gnostic sense by the Corinthians. (18)

However, the other uses of πνευματικός in our letter clearly originated in Paul's own thinking and express his own usage. In each case (9:11; 10:3,4; 15:43,44), as Paul is introducing a new idea into the discussion, the use of πνευματικός should truly reflect his intended meaning of the word. When we look at 9:11, "If we have sown spiritual (πνευματικά) good among you, is it too much if we reap your material benefits?", it is clear that the term does not refer to the Spirit but means the gospel, things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, heavenly things. (19) Again, though not quite the same, it is apparent that πνευματικός in 10:3,4 means "heavenly", "from heaven" or "supernatural". (20) In both cases it refers to the heavenly, divine or supernatural nature of the object described. Although this suggests that its use in 15:44 is probably similar, it must be judged in its context. The meaning of σῶμα πνευματικόν in 15:44 will now be considered more closely.

There are four main explanations of the contrast between σῶμα ψυχικόν and σῶμα πνευματικόν (v. 44). First, it has been suggested by some theologians that Paul has in mind the Hellenistic contrast of materiality and immateriality. This view may be consistent with the form in which the question may have been put by the Hellenistic "spiritual" members of the Corinthian Church. However, while the comparison of φθορά with ἀφθαρσία is probably associated with this kind of thinking, the other two contrasts (and especially ἀτιμία) go well beyond a mere antithesis of substance. It is therefore inadequate to say that πνευματικόν means "immaterial" (see below).

Another view, which is a compromise between Hellenistic and Jewish ideas, suggests that the comparison is between two kinds of substances, one fitted for earth and the other for heaven, the one perishable, the other imperishable. For example, J. Weiss calls πνευματικός "fine, imperishable, heavenly fabric". (21) This view is also subject to the same criticism mentioned above, for the last two comparisons (ἀσθένεια / δύναμις and ἀτιμία / δόξα) are not concerned with aspects of substance. However, proponents of this view consider that Paul regarded δόξα and δύναμις as, in some sense, substantial.

The third opinion emphasises Jewish notions of transcendence in the terms δόξα , δύναμις and πνεῦμα . Here πνευματικός is interpreted to mean "indwelt by the Spirit". (22) A. C. Thiselton in supporting this view says: "the significance of

φθορά lay in its penal rather than its metaphysical character."(23) But he acknowledges that Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich do not include this meaning, but simply say "of the state of being perishable."(24) On ἀτιμία Thiselton is on surer ground when he says that shame is the result of sin, and adds "It is therefore difficult to see how man's earthliness alone can be a cause of shame."(25) On ἀσθένεια he says that it "stands for all that is in contrast to the Holy Spirit." (26) But Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich show that this is not really the case. They indicate that ἀσθένεια is concerned with weakness of character, "weakness in judgment ... lack of religious insight ... moral weakness." (27) Similarly, on the other side of the comparison it is claimed that δόξα and δύναμις (28) are truly only designations for God and the Holy Spirit. But the use of δόξα in the chapter (vv. 40-41) and δύναμις elsewhere by Paul forbid this restriction.

The study of these terms has indicated that φθορά is concerned with the decay and impermanence of man's substance, ἀτιμία reflects the moral and spiritual results of his fallen condition and ἀσθένεια is mainly concerned with man's weakness of character. The three words overlap in meaning, but together represent a fairly complete picture of man's condition in the world as a result of sin and as a member of the old aeon. By comparison, the contrasting terms (ἀφθαρσία , δόξα , δύναμις) indicate the completeness of man's future existence when transformed by God in the glorious resurrection.

This then leads us to the fourth and most satisfactory possibility for the meaning of πνευματικόν in verse 44. The

σῶμα ψυχικόν , which typifies all that man's condition after the fall <u>really</u> is, is contrasted with the body transformed and fitted for God's world, that is, πνευματικόν means "heavenly", or "supernatural", "belonging to the age to come" (similar to ἐπουράνιος in vv. 47-49). Whether this new body has been recreated by the Spirit is not stated. It is possible that this heavenly nature is thought of substantially by Paul, but this also is not clear from the letter.

We now come to consider more closely the meaning of 1 Cor. 15:45 and, in particular, Paul's use of πνεῦμα in this verse. From the outset we may be sure that this much discussed verse was not meant by Paul as a christological crux or as a digression. It is a difficult phrase in the middle of a semi-poetic assertion of the certainty of resurrection. Nevertheless, he may have casually introduced a profound truth that is more explicit elsewhere.

A number of commentators (29) do not regard πνεῦμα in verse 45 as the Holy Spirit. On the other hand I. Hermann, though regarding πνεῦμα in 15:45 as the Holy Spirit, sees only a "functional" identity between the Spirit and Christ.(30) Hermann supports this view from a detailed exegesis of 2 Corinthians 3 and especially verses 17 and 18. Although not necessarily identifying Christ and the Spirit in 1 Cor.15:45, C. K. Barrett also regards πνεῦμα in this verse as the Holy Spirit. He says:

> "For him (Paul), the conception of a New Man is given concreteness by the resurrection, after which, in terms

> of the Spirit, Jesus became the Son of God in power (Rom. 1:4). The resurrection means the Spirit, and Spirit is (for Paul, as in biblical thought generally) not merely alive but creatively life-giving (cf. John 6:63)." (31)

This view explains the "life-giving" (ζωοποιοῦν) well, as this term is normally restricted in its reference to God and occasionally to the Holy Spirit (but see further discussion below). However, it does not satisfactorily agree with the use of πνευματικόν in verses 43 and 44 or explain the anarthrous use of πνεῦμα .

When we look further at verse 45 we see that ἐγένετο should be understood in the second clause. In the words of N. Q. Hamilton, "The 'becoming' (ἐγένετο) of the first half of the verse applies obviously to this second half." (32) The quotation from Genesis 2:7 in this verse is almost identical with the LXX except that the word order differs slightly. As God was said to have "breathed" into man with the result that he became a living being (Gen. 2:7), it is possible that the activity of the Spirit (God's "breath") is meant to be understood in the second part of the verse. But, as will be seen below, this would be inconsistent with the rest of Chapter 15 and with verse 22 in particular.

Not only is the Adam/Christ contrast to be found in v. 22, but also the same word ζωοποιεῖν . What Paul means here is that, whereas man as a totality lay under the sentence of condemnation and death through disobedience, so the new

eschatological community "in Christ" is given life by God because of the obedience of Christ even unto death. Throughout the whole chapter God is the giver of life (vv. 36,38), the one who raises the dead (vv. 13, 14, 15, 20), who has the authority (v. 27) and in whom will be the consummation of all things (v. 28).

On the two other occasions when the verb ζωοποιεῖν is used in Chapter 15 it is used of God and not of Christ or the Spirit. This is also the predominant usage of the word elsewhere in the New Testament. (33) Throughout this section, God's action is in mind and not that of Christ or the Spirit. It is God who breathed on Adam making him a living being and God who raised Jesus and exalted him to His right hand in power. As in 1 Cor. 1-4, Paul's probable intention is to direct his hearers' attention and allegiance away from themselves to the omnipotent active God.

Our only method for determining more exactly what the contrast between Adam and Christ means in verse 45 is to look for guide lines to the parallel reflected elsewhere in Paul's writings. In Romans 1:4 he says that Christ was "designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead ..." This verse best explains the time factor suggested by the ἐγένετο. (34) That is, ἐγένετο refers to Christ's resurrection, ascension and exaltation as Lord to the right hand of God (cf. Phil. 2:5-9). (35) A similar view of this time aspect is well expressed by E. Schweizer:

"It is made explicit in 1 Cor. 15:45 that by his

resurrection Christ has become 'the spirit that maketh alive' πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν ."(36)

Paul therefore means by 15:45 that whereas Adam was given life sufficient for a limited physical existence, the result of Christ's obedience and death on the Cross has been his resurrection and exaltation. Therefore Christ has become the means whereby the new eschatological community of faith also partakes of his resurrected eternal life. That is, he is the means whereby God gives life and in this sense he has become "life-giving" ζωοποιοῦν . Because of his obedience even to death, God raised him to this position of honour and exalted him to a heavenly existence - a spiritual existence (πνεῦμα). Similar conclusions concerning the meaning of πνεῦμα in 15:45 are drawn by J. Héring:

> "The second Adam is 'pneuma', because he is a spiritual creature, i.e. supernatural (in the sense of 'pneumatikon', 15:44) whereas the first Adam is 'psuche', i.e. a natural being (cf. the sense of 'psuchikon' in 15:44)." (37)

This more general meaning for πνεῦμα is also supported by its anarthrous use. Thus Godet comments that there is no article before πνεῦμα "as if this were His exclusive privilege." (38) Πνεῦμα here may also have the corporate idea in it as suggested by M. E. Dahl, "the human totality...begins as a body-animate.. It ends as a body-spiritual." (39)

Hence, we have found that πνεῦμα in 15:45 is virtually equivalent to the use of πνευματικόν in 15:44. That is, it does not refer directly to the Holy Spirit but rather it is

concerned with the resurrection and exaltation of Christ and means "supernatural", "heavenly existence", "beyond the confines of this aeon". This then is a different use of πνεῦμα from that which is to be found elsewhere in this letter. But its uniqueness should not allow us to reject the meaning especially as πνευματικός bears a similar meaning in the same letter. In fact the variety of ways in which Paul uses the word πνεῦμα in this letter has already become apparent.

In conclusion, although 1 Cor. 15 contains more about resurrection than any of Paul's other writings it by no means exhausts his teaching on the subject, for his words in this chapter are chosen to meet the situation in Corinth. Thus, resurrection is presented in apocalyptic terms which would be readily understood in Corinth. However no mention is made of the Spirit's role in resurrection. But we see hints of such a role in 6:14 and 15:44-46 (σῶμα πνευματικόν) which correspond fairly well with the statements found in Romans (1:4(?), 8:11) and 2 Corimthians (1:22, 5:5). This absence of the Spirit's role in resurrection is closely connected with (and perhaps a result of) the simple "putting on" [40] ideas of resurrection and the glorification process in 1 Corinthians (15:53,54) which contrast with the more complex process of adoption to sonship, suffering, sanctification, and resurrection to glory in the power of the Spirit, found in 2 Corinthians (3:18 - 4:15), Galatians (4:6,7, 5:16ff.) and Romans (8:18ff.).

NOTES ON CHAPTER 8

1. The Resurrection of the Dead, p. 107.

2. 1 Cor., p. 156.

3. See pp. 52, 53.

4. 1 Cor., p. 312.

5. M. E. Dahl, The Resurrection of the Body, p. 74.

6. Three other suggestions put forward as to the possible error in the Corinthians' thinking about resurrection are as follows:

   (i) C. K. Barrett says that some of the Corinthians thought that the resurrection was already past. He continues - "The idea of a resurrection that has already happened is genuinely Christian, but it is one that Christians of a gnostic type were able to adopt and press in a one-sided way. Paul affirms both resurrection and its futurity." (1 Cor., p. 348). But R. McL. Wilson (Gnosis and the New Testament, p. 36) says: "It is at least open to question whether the heresy of 2 Timothy 3:18, that the resurrection has already past, was current at Corinth in Paul's life-time."

   (ii) There was no after-life at all. R. Bultmann (T.N.T. Vol. 1, p. 169) supports this view, but

it seems unlikely, as baptising for the dead (v. 29) suggests a concern for the after-life.

(iii) Only those who were alive at the parousia would enter the Kingdom of God. (A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 93.)

7. E.-B Allo, 1 Cor., pp. 387,9; W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 304; F. Godet, 1 Cor., Vol 2, pp. 321-5; H. L. Goudge, 1 Cor., p. 137; F. Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 356; J. Héring, 1 Cor., p. 173; J. Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 240; L. Morris, 1 Cor., pp. 209-10; Robertson and Plummer, 1 Cor., pp. 346,7; G. Simon, 1 Cor., p. 138.

8. Gnosis and the New Testament, p. 53.

9. See Chapter 6 note 52, p. 142.

10. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 166.

11. Op. cit., p. 84.

12. Op. cit., p. 78, n. 2.

13. Spirit of God, pp. 87,88.

14. C. K. Barrett, 1 Cor., pp. 372,3; J. Héring, 1 Cor., p. 176; J. Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 260; M. E. Dahl, op. cit., p. 121.

15. Probably the following: 2:13, 12:1 (?), 14:1.

16. E. Schweizer (Spirit of God, p. 88) says "In 1 Cor. XIV. I πνευματικά means the totality of spiritual gifts (note: also XII.I)."

17. 2:13, 15; 3:1; 12:1 (?); 14:37 (This caution is also needed with regard to the hapax legomenon πνευματικῶς 2:14, and the minor reading in 2:13- B 33).

18. On the other hand Paul may have used the term when first at Corinth and later abandoned it when he saw the confusion it caused.

19. For example - T. Edwards, 1 Cor., p. 231, F. Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 206, J. Héring, 1 Cor., p. 78, E. Schweizer, op. cit., p. 87. C. K. Barrett prefers to see πνευματικά in 9:11 as referring to spiritual gifts (1 Cor., p. 206).

20. So E.-B. Allo, 1 Cor., pp. 230,231, H. L. Goudge, 1 Cor., p. 84, F. Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 220, J. Héring, 1 Cor., p. 86, J. Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 129.

21. J. Weiss, Earliest Christianity, Vol. 2, p. 535.

22. C. K. Barrett may be supporting this view when he speaks of the spiritual body as "the new body, animated by the Spirit of God, with which the same man will be clothed

and equipped in the age to come, which he reaches (supposing him to die before the parusia) by way of resurrection" (1 Cor., pp. 372,373).

23. Op. cit., pp. 226,227.

24. Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich, p. 865.

25. Op. cit., p. 232.

26. Loc. cit.

27. Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich, p. 114.

28. E. Schweizer, op. cit., p. 57.

29. E.-B. Allo, 1 Cor., p. 427, T. Edwards, 1 Cor., p. 442, F. Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 387, J. Héring, 1 Cor., p. 178.

30. Op. cit., p. 140.

31. 1 Cor., p. 374, also W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 177.

32. Op. cit., p. 14.

33. Rom. 4:17, 8:11. Similarly 1 Tim. 6:13ff., Jn. 5:21, 1 Pet. 3:18(?). But in 2 Cor. 3:6 it is used of the Spirit (cf. also Jn 6:63).

34. So also Robertson and Plummer, 1 Cor., p. 373. Godet suggests the ἐγένετο refers to his whole life (1 Cor., Vol. 2, p. 422) and Edwards to his incarnation (1 Cor. p.414).

35. In 1:30, ἐγενήθη refers to the whole of Christ's life and exaltation. But Rom. 1:4 seems a closer parallel because it is concerned with the pneuma existence.

36. Op. cit., p. 60.

37. 1 Cor., p. 178.

38. 1 Cor., Vol. 1, p. 421.

39. Op. cit., p. 81.

40. C. F. D. Moule ("St. Paul and Dualism" NTS 12, 1965-66, pp. 120,121) says "If so, we have a definite contrast between 1 Cor. 15 and 2 Cor. 5 ... in terms of 'addition' in 1 Cor. 15, over against 'exchange' in 2 Cor. 5."

CHAPTER 9

THE SPIRIT AND ESCHATOLOGY

It is now necessary to further investigate the relationship between eschatology and the Spirit. In particular, we are concerned about two matters - first, to decide whether the Spirit is clearly spoken of by Paul as an eschatological entity and second, to determine what influence the expectation of the parousia may have had upon Paul's pneumatology. For, if Paul did think that Christ would return in his own lifetime, this belief would probably have affected the presentation of his pneumatology.

It is accepted by most modern commentators and students of the Pauline letters that eschatological thinking underlies Paul's theology. For example, W. D. Davies says:

> "The encounter with the living Christ, the awareness of living in a new creation, the influx of the Gentiles into the true Israel, the experience of a new moral exodus, the discovery of a New Torah and the advent of the Spirit, all these were for Paul eschatological phenomena." (1)

Similar conclusions are reached by N. Q. Hamilton with regard to Paul's teaching on the Spirit:

> "The Spirit is primarily an eschatological entity." (2)
>
> "The activity of the Spirit we know in Christ belongs properly to the future and is understandable only as a property of the future age." (3)

With regard to 1 Corinthians A. C. Thiselton comments:

> "The means by which the eschatological community builds upon the foundation that is laid (3:11) is the power of the Holy Spirit (12:4ff.)." (4)

Although it will be noticed that two of the comments given above refer to Paul's letters generally and not specifically to 1 Corinthians, nevertheless the two are meant to include 1 Corinthians.

The term eschatology literally means the "last things", and this suggests that it is a subject concerned with events which will lead up to and include the "end of all things". But Paul and other N.T. writers saw themselves as already living in the "last days". They believed that the "end-times" had begun and that certain events, particularly the death and resurrection of the Messiah and the advent of the Spirit, had brought the new age into being. Therefore W. Manson could write about eschatology:

> "The Resurrection of Jesus is not simply a sign which God has granted in favour of His Son, but is the inauguration, the entrance into history, of <u>the times of the End</u>." (5)

Thus, eschatology is not a specialised study of particular future events, but a particular way of looking at events which are central to the whole Christian proclamation. (6) In consequence, eschatology has featured throughout our discussion of 1 Corinthians (7) and could not be limited to only one section of our study.

Even a cursory reading of the letter reveals that Paul continually reminds the Corinthians of the parousia of Christ. As well as referring to it in his introductory (1:7 and 8) and concluding remarks (16:22), he does so very obviously on at least five other separate occasions (4:5, 5:5, 7:29-31, 11:26, 15:23). Resurrection and its accompanying glorification is also presented as an event intimately linked with the Lord's coming (15:23, 49).

In a less obvious way, by following the Jewish [8] time pattern of aeons (8:13, 2:8, 10:11) he regards his hearers as having entered the new eschatological age through the activity of the Spirit when they believed and were baptised. [9] By submitting to the Lordship of Christ they were now living in tension between the old aeon which was passing away and the new aeon (or Kingdom of God - 4:20) already inaugurated. But it is not immediately clear in our letter whether the Spirit is meant to be regarded as an eschatological entity. However, the underlying contrast between the "rulers of this age" not comprehending the significance of the Cross of Christ and God revealing this through the Spirit to the converts at Corinth, suggests clearly enough that the Spirit is meant to be seen as the life-force and interpreter of the new aeon. In that Paul's preaching demonstrated the presence of the Kingdom of God in Spirit and power (2:4), we detect a similar eschatological outlook that decidedly contrasted with the world's persuasive wisdom. However, before continuing with this general appreciation of Paul's eschatological thinking it is necessary to assess the

Corinthians' views on the subject as they have considerable bearing on what Paul says in 1 Corinthians.

A. C. Thiselton goes a little too far when he says "The crisis which called forth the writing of 1 Corinthians depended primarily upon a misunderstanding of Christian eschatology." (10) Nevertheless his words underline the importance of considering the Corinthians' thinking about eschatology in order to reach a true understanding of what Paul says on the subject. We can see their eschatological thinking most clearly in 1 Corinthians 4:8ff. where Paul contrasts his own miserable state with their claims:

> "Already you are filled! Already you have become rich! Without us you have become kings! ... We are weak, but you are strong. You are held in honour, but we in disrepute..." (from vv. 8 - 10).

These words of Paul above almost certainly reflect the Corinthians' claims as expressed by A. D. Nock - "They were kings (4:8), they were in the Spirit." (11) G. Deluz sees it like this - "The Messianic Kingdom seems to have come at Corinth." (12) If we were to use present-day terminology, we would call them extreme "realized eschatologists". (13) They saw themselves as already living in the Messianic kingdom, (14) filled with the Spirit, free from the world, resurrected with Christ and reigning with him, awaiting his coming in a short time. In consequence they thought that they had no use for the flesh (cf. 1 Cor. 15:39ff.), were indifferent to morality

(e.g., Chapters 5-7) and boasted of their new superior resurrection status (1:31, 3:21, 4:8ff.). In contrast to a true Christian eschatology which centres on God, "Fundamentally the emphasis at Corinth remained unquestionably upon man."(15) In their contempt for the flesh, morality and the world, they displayed the typical gnostic outlook. This is well illustrated by R. Bultmann's comments on gnosticism:

> "The same superiority over the world might be shown in a libertinism emancipated from all moral obligations ... this present world has ceased to be of any importance ... once he has attained to liberty the Gnostic cannot be affected by anything from the outside." (16)

As we consider Paul's reply to this situation at Corinth we must now determine whether the evidence is conclusive that Paul, when he wrote to the Corinthians, believed the parousia was imminent and whether he thought he would be alive when Christ returned.

Whether Paul thought that the Lord would return in his own lifetime when he wrote 1 Corinthians continues to be a matter of debate.(17) C. H. Dodd, the champion for seeing development in Paul's eschatological thinking, led the modern discussion of this subject with these comments on 1 Thessalonians:

> "At any rate, Paul is certain that he himself and the majority of his converts will be alive to 'meet the Lord in the air' ... Some seven years later, in writing 1 Corinthians, Paul still betrays his conviction that he and at least some of his converts will be alive to meet

> the Lord. ... After 1 Corinthians we hear no more of that confident expectation, so far at least as Paul himself is concerned."(18)

Then in commenting on Rom. 13:11-14, he added:

> "The consummation indeed is still awaited, but awaited without urgency, because the substance of our hope is a present possession."(19)

It is now therefore necessary to consider the view that Paul may have expected Christ's return in his own lifetime when he wrote 1 and 2 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. The argument that Paul did expect an imminent parousia is basically:

(a) In the Thessalonian correspondence Paul believed he would be alive at the parousia.

(b) There is no apparent change of view in 1 Corinthians and there is further evidence to support (a).

(c) A distinct change of view is noticed in 2 Corinthians.

(d) Further evidence in Paul's later letters supports (c).(20)

However, some scholars point to statements of Paul such as 2 Cor. 1:14, Rom. 8:19, 13:11-14, Phil. 3:20 and 4:5(21) as casting serious doubt on Dodd's conclusions. For example R. Schnackenburg writes:

> "So the characteristic early Christian imminent expectation was (unlike Jewish apocalyptic feeling) not orientated by the short space of time still to elapse but by the certainty of the ineluctably approaching end and at bottom (.....) was only interested in that. This

> kind of imminent expectation is rather "perpetual expectation" (H. Schürmann), as is shown in the exhortations moulding the eschatological attitude,... no mention is heard of any real crisis provoked by the alleged "delay of the Parousia" ... Scarcely anything can be detected in the New Testament regarding a diminution of eschatological tension."(22)

We will now briefly consider the evidence in the Pauline letters (particularly 1 and 2 Thessalonians) against Dodd's view.

The argument against the view that Paul believed in an imminent parousia when he wrote 1 Thessalonians is well expressed by A. L. Moore.(23) He analyses 1 Thess. 4:13-18 carefully and contends that -

(1) ἡμεῖς in these verses refers to the church in general and not to a particular group, including Paul himself.

(2) 1 Thess. 4:15 and 17 leave open the possibility that Paul and his readers may be alive at the parousia or may die prior to it.

(3) In 1 Thess. 4:15 and 17 the "we" is expanded, supporting the contention that "we" is an open idea.

(4) "It would appear unlikely that Paul's personal experiences should have led him to any confident expectation of life."(24) He also adds that 2 Cor. 5:9 and Phil. 1:20, 23 all speak of the dual possibility that they might be alive or dead.

It is also evident that Paul does not clearly say in any of his letters that he believed he would be alive at the parousia.

In fact, he warns against speculation about the precise time of Christ's coming (1 Thess. 5:1ff.) as well as indicating that his hearers already know that they should not participate in such speculation. In this regard he undoubtedly reflects the warnings of Jesus to his disciples to be on the alert at all times (Matt.24:43, Lk. 17:24). Again, if 2 Thessalonians is regarded as Pauline, we here see Paul emphasising that the parousia is not yet (2 Thess. 2: 1ff.) but that a number of future events must precede it. Thus, the many references to the parousia in the Thessalonian correspondence are probably best explained by the very considerable interest in the subject shown by his hearers (perhaps begun and encouraged by such an emphasis in Paul's original preaching there)[25] rather than because Paul believed the parousia was imminent. However, it is likely that the Thessalonians thought the parousia was to occur almost immediately.

When we turn to 1 Corinthians, we notice that although Paul emphasises the parousia, he does not speak of it as much as he did in 1 and 2 Thessalonians. He mentions that they watch for the Lord's appearing (1: 7,8), that there are present distresses (7:26), and that the time is short (7:29). Also, in explaining the resurrection he refers to Christ's coming in apocalyptic terms reminiscent of the Thessalonian correspondence (1 Cor. 15: 23ff.). But, as we have shown above,[26] Paul's emphasis on the parousia, rather than intending to stress the imminence of Christ's coming, seems to be dictated by a desire to warn his hearers of the coming Judgment and therefore that they should forsake their immoral practices. In addition, the

closing words of the epistle which include Marana tha probably have liturgical significance [27] and therefore should not be pressed to infer that they show Paul thought the parousia was imminent.

The strongest hint in 1 Corinthians that Paul may have thought of himself as being alive at the parousia is found in 15:50-52, and especially the words of verse 52: "the dead (οἱ νεκροὶ) will be raised imperishable and we (ἡμεῖς) shall be changed (ἀλλαγησόμεθα)." It has been suggested by some scholars that what Paul meant here was that, in contrast to the others who have died, we (emphatic ἡμεῖς) who are alive will not have to be raised but will be transformed. Now it has already been seen that Paul often uses "we" (ἡμεῖς) not to refer to himself and the other Christian leaders only but to themselves as typical of all Christians.[28] But even if this is not what Paul meant in v. 52, he has indicated that some of the "we" will have died - "we shall not all sleep" (v. 51).

However the issue may not be satisfactorily assessed without reference to 6:14 - "And God raised the Lord and will also raise us (ἡμᾶς) up (ἐξήγειρεν)[29] by his power." This verse indicates that Paul thought of himself as possibly dying before the parousia.[30] It is not possible to spiritualise the idea of "raising" to mean starting a new life, especially when the method, διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ , is mentioned. We may note the close parallel in Romans 8:11 -"He... will give life to your mortal bodies through his Spirit which dwells in you."

Returning now to 1 Corinthians 15:52, we see that the use of ἡμεῖς can be explained satisfactorily in two ways. It is quite natural to refer to dead Christians as "the dead" even if it may include oneself, the "we" being a general term for those Christians still alive (as Paul and his hearers were). He naturally identifies himself with those who are alive. A. L. Moore comes to similar conclusions -

> "Here (vv. 51-52) the first person plural is taken by many as meaning that Paul includes himself amongst those who will not die. This is extremely unlikely. To press the form of the expression so, would mean that in 1 Cor. 6, 14 Paul expected certainly to die. In fact Paul probably means Christians generally - as, we suggest, he means in 1 Thess. 4, 15;17."(31)

On the other hand E.-B. Allo suggests that Paul's emphasis is not on a contrast between those dead and those alive, but on the joy of being transformed:

> "Car si Paul écrit ἡμεῖς, "nous", c'est, je crois, moins pour l'apposer à οἱ νεκροί, que pour l'expression concentrée et savourée de son attente joyeuse: "nous serons transformés, nous!" nous, nous-mêmes, morts ou vivants..."(32)

It is also decidedly dubious whether such a view as "We will be alive at the parousia" could ever be confidently held in a world where disease (we hear of Paul's thorn in the flesh - a disease perhaps?), natural disasters and riot were so prolific. This is particularly true of Palestine and of a man such as Paul who lived so dangerously. Such uncertainty about being

alive a few years thence contrasted drastically with the unshakeable faith of Paul and his converts in their Lord who would return. In fact, Paul's words in 1 Cor. 4:9 strongly suggest that he thought he may have to face martyrdom in the future: "For I think that God has exhibited us apostles as last of all, like men sentenced to death."

While holding to a development in Paul's thinking, C. F. D. Moule contends that this development was due more to other particular circumstances than to any delay in the parousia. He says:

> "There are, as we know, within the New Testament, statements about the last things which it is difficult to fit into a single system;.. They (the statements about the last things) are produced (to use Papias' celebrated phrase) πρὸς τὰς χρείας, to meet each need as it arises."(33)

We conclude that the evidence in 1 and 2 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, though not conclusive, does not indicate that Paul believed Christ must return in his own lifetime. However, even if this were not so, it also seems unlikely that a crisis occurred within the Christian congregation because of a "delay" in the parousia. Thus the change in pneumatology from 1 Corinthians to Paul's later letters does not seem to be solely dependent on a change in his eschatological thinking. It is therefore important to look for other factors which may have affected Paul's presentation of his teaching on the Spirit in 1 Corinthians.

A second possibility is that Paul's theology developed from 1 Corinthians to his later letters, such as Galatians, 2 Corinthians and Romans, with the result that some of his ideas about the Spirit developed later. But many other important Pauline doctrines are also seemingly absent from 1 Corinthians such as justification by faith, the law and the Spirit/flesh contrast. Also the fact that Paul preached "Christ and him crucified" (1:23) and maintained that "if Christ has not been raised, your faith is vain, you are still in your sins" (15:17), almost certainly presumes that he was holding to the doctrine of justification by faith, especially when it is enunciated in terms reminiscent of 1 Cor. 15:45 (cf. 2 Cor. 5:14-21). Thus G. Bornkamm can say "Justification is not explicitly discussed in the letter to the Corinthians ... but underlies his thinking and missionary motives."(34) The brief references to the law (9:8,9,20,21, 14:21, 15:56) also make it apparent that Paul had thought out clearly his attitude to the law.(35) Similarly, with reference to the Thessalonian correspondence, W. Neil[illegible] can say:

> "Thus it would not be a correct judgment to regard doctrines which are not dealt with at length in Thessalonians e.g. Justification by Faith, Atonement, Grace, and so on, as later developments in the Apostle's thought."(36)

When we return to Paul's teaching on the Spirit in 1 Corinthians similar results obtain. Although nothing is said clearly about the Spirit's role in resurrection, 6:14 and 15:44-46 seem to presume such a role. Other eschatological

aspects of the Spirit are also evident in 1 Corinthians - the Spirit is the Spirit of the new age (2:6-10), the temple is the eschatological temple of the last days indwelt by the Spirit (3:16, 6:19) and the Spirit has originated the new life in Christ (12:1ff.). It therefore seems most unlikely that Paul's eschatological understanding of the Spirit was undeveloped when he wrote 1 Corinthians. This leads us to consider a third possibility.

The answer that best fits the evidence is that Paul, aware of his hearers' situation, chose his words and the content of his teaching to answer their problems at a level that they would understand . That is, the main reason for the lack of emphasis on the Spirit's activity within the believer seems to be because the Corinthian believers over-emphasised the Spirit's indwelling. Hence, Paul deliberately chose to avoid stressing the Spirit's indwelling. Thus, A. C. Thiselton could say:

> "At Corinth the Christian community was conscious of its eschatological possession of the Spirit only too well. Paul was compelled to develop with great care his own thought on the subject."(37)

J. G. Gager also considers that Paul adapted his language to meet specific situations. He says:

> "If our analysis thus far has been on the mark, we can no longer assume that the "apocalyptic" or end-time perspective provides the sole point of departure for interpreting Paul's letters. Instead we have seen that he argues differently in different situations, adapting his language to meet specific occasions."(38)

The Corinthians considered themselves to be members of the new age but were forgetting that they also lived in the old aeon which was still present though passing away. To combat this "over-realized" eschatology at Corinth, Paul's eschatological emphasis in 1 Corinthians clearly lay on the "not yet" and in particular on the coming parousia of Christ as judge and on the future resurrection. In consequence he said very little about his readers' new eschatological existence of freedom, life in the Spirit and glory (but cf. 2 Cor. 3:18). When we consider his statements about the Spirit we find they are mainly centred on what the Spirit has achieved and not on the Spirit's present or future activity. However, Paul's statements about the Spirit using the past tense were not intended to support the Corinthians' eschatological position. Rather, they were intended to correct their understanding of the gospel and of the Spirit's activity amongst them when the gospel had been first preached at Corinth. It has also been shown that eschatology is firmly planted within Paul's theology and that the Spirit's role within this eschatological scheme is evident although not immediately obvious in 1 Corinthians.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 9

1. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 285.

2. Op. cit., pp. 37,38.

3. Op. cit., p. 18, similarly also R. Bultmann, C. K. Barrett, C. H. Dodd, E. Stauffer.

4. Eschatology and the Holy Spirit With Special Reference to 1 Corinthians, p. 161.

5. Eschatology, SJT Occ. Paper, No. 2, p.6.

6. C. K. Barrett, referring to later Christian generations says that often for them "eschatology becomes the 'doctrine of the last things' instead of a definition and determination of the present." (From First Adam to Last, p. 118).

7. For example pp. 54-56, 74-76, 133.

8. "The attempt to derive his eschatology from Hellenism I consider to be misguided" - H. J. Schoeps, Paul, p. 88.

9. C. K. Barrett says that "The believer ... accepts baptism as a sign and means of his entering the new creation." (From First Adam to Last, p. 109).

10. Op. cit., p. 137.

11. St. Paul, p. 174. Similarly J. Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 49.

12. A Companion to 1 Corinthians, p. 47. Cf. J. Héring, p. 29.

13. So N. A. Dahl "Paul and the Church at Corinth According to 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21" in Christian History and Interpretation, p. 332.

14. This may explain the need for Paul's words in 1 Cor. 15:24 about the futurity of the "end".

15. A. C. Thiselton, op. cit., p. 145. Similarly K. Barth, The Resurrection of the Dead, p. 18, and J. Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 39.

16. Primitive Christianity In Its Contemporary Setting, p. 170.

17. H. J. Schoeps (Paul, pp. 100,101) suggests that Paul expected that the messianic age, which in Jewish thinking was to occur before the eschaton, would only last for forty years.

18. New Testament Studies, p. 110.

19. Op. cit. p.111.

20. D. E. H. Whiteley (The Theology of St. Paul pp.233-248) well summarises Dodd's position and concludes: "It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that subsequent criticism has weakened Dodd's case, but not destroyed it." Others who have similar views on this subject are R. Bultmann T.N.T., Vol. 1, p. 103, A. Deissmann, Paul, p. 217, Robertson and Plummer, 1 Cor., p. 376, C. A. A. Scott, Footnotes to St. Paul, p. 140.

21. However C. H. Dodd doubts whether Phil. 4:5 refers to the parousia. He says "the context here is not eschatological, and the words are a reminiscence of Psalm 145:18." (New Testament Studies, p. 112).

22. The Church in the New Testament, pp. 122,3. Similar doubts about the presence of development in Paul's theology are also expressed by E.-B. Allo (1 Cor., p. 145), N. Q. Hamilton (op. cit., p. 61ff.), J. Lowe "An Examination of Attempts to Detect Development in St. Paul's Theology" JTS, 42, (1941), p. 129ff.). Schnackenburg also opposes Schoeps' view that Paul expected only a short messianic age in a similar fashion to the Qumran fragment on Psalm 37:10 and the Damascus Document. (Paul, p. 100ff.)

23. The Parousia in the New Testament, p. 108ff., similarly L. Morris, 1 Cor., pp. 232,233.

24. Op. cit., p. 110.

25. J. C. Hurd says "it is clear that Paul in his early preaching was enthusiastically apocalyptic" (op. cit., p. 284).

26. See pp. 128-132.

27. So O. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 13ff. But C. F. D. Moule ("A Reconsideration of the Context of Maranatha", NTS 6, pp. 307-310) says of maranatha: "while appropriate to the eucharist, it is not confined to it." (p. 310).

28. J. Héring (1 Cor., p. 180) says "'we' can have a wider sense - 'we men' - that is those among men still alive when that time comes."

29. Text $\mathfrak{p}^{46\,c1}$ ℵ $\mathfrak{C}^{3}_{pm}$ vg; εξηγειρεν $\mathfrak{p}^{46c2}$ B 1739 *t* Or; h: εξεγειρει $\mathfrak{p}^{11.46*}$ AD/69 *pc*
The textual evidence favours the text of Nestle-Aland (so also U.B.S. text and Nestle-Kilpatrick). The meaning of the verse seems quite straightforward but D. E. H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul, p. 242, suggests: "He may be employing the word 'raise' (egeirein; the tense of the verb varies in different MSS.) in a general sense, which would cover both the 'raising' or 'awakening' which is pre-supposed and also the 'changing' which is mentioned in 1 Cor. 15:51, 'We shall not all die, but we shall all be changed'."

30. E.-B. Allo, 1 Cor., p. 145.

31. The Parousia in the New Testament, p. 118.

32. Op. cit., pp. 433,434.

33. JTS 15 (N.S) April, 1964, p. 5.

34. "The Missionary Stance of Paul in 1 Cor. 9 and Acts" in Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 196, ff.

35. See pp. 19-21.

36. 1 Thess., p.xxx.

37. Op. cit., p. 137.

38. "Functional Diversity in Paul's Use of End-Time Language," JBL 89 Sept., 1970, p.337.

CHAPTER 10

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The same singlemindedness of purpose, to win all men for Christ, that typified Paul the missionary, again manifested itself in Paul the writer to the Corinthians. From the beginning of his Christian experience, the Spirit (for law-conscious Paul) was pre-eminently a fact of his own and the Church's experience. But, at the same time, he also regarded the Spirit as the Spirit of "him who fulfilled the law". He wrote to the Corinthians as their father in Christ, continuing his mission through his letter, rather than as a systematic theologian or as a sedentary pastor. Thus, his missionary zeal to be "all things to all men... that I may win some" directed the form and content of his letter.

Many questions, such as the relationships between baptism and the Spirit or faith and the Spirit, he did not ask or answer. But this does not mean that his letter had not been carefully thought out and expressed. On the contrary, it produced a dynamic rather than a static context for his statements about the Spirit. For example, Paul related his comments about the Spirit to his teaching mission in Corinth rather than to theoretical considerations about baptism. Thus Paul referred to the Spirit mainly in the past tense as an event rather than as part of his early teaching. However, the situation in Corinth when he wrote his first letter to the believers there demanded further explanations of the Spirit's

nature and activities.

Like the kerygmatic preaching of the Early Church, Paul's preaching seems to have included little about the Spirit, except to explain the overt signs and miraculous phenomena which accompanied his preaching. His readers had been taught that the Spirit, who had given them their charismata and indwelt the church and the individual believer, was the Spirit of the last days. But above all, the Spirit was a fact in the experience of individual Corinthian believers which reminded them of the beginnings of their church.

Although circumstances in Corinth were very complex when Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, a number of aspects of the situation are reasonably sure. The view that there were no factions nor Judaising at this stage but simply divisions among church members for non-theological reasons seems substantially correct. Amidst a gifted, enthusiastic, Spirit-filled Church, a number of more prominent members with spectacular spiritual gifts had elevated themselves or had been elevated by the other members, to positions of hero worship characterised by gnostic tendencies and pride. To some the Messianic Kingdom had come at Corinth. In their thinking, these "spiritual" members seemed to have divorced the Spirit from the preaching of Christ crucified and from God Himself. Their actions and attitudes were denying the Christ whom they claimed to serve. Thus they almost regarded the Spirit as their own possession. To them the Spirit had become equated with their ability to perform miracles and in particular with speaking in tongues.

In attempting to correct the proud and divisive members of the Corinthian Church, some of whom probably regarded the Spirit as a miraculous ability of their leaders only, Paul emphasised that the Spirit was God's Spirit. For not only did the Spirit give spectacular gifts, but He also revealed Christ, God's wisdom and power. Paul tried to direct their attention away from pride in the Spirit's indwelling to the historic coming of the Spirit amongst them when the gospel was preached. Certainly the Spirit gave miraculous gifts, but more important than this, the Spirit was the Spirit of the gospel of the crucified and risen Christ. In the light of this, Paul recognised that the signs and miracles which accompanied his first preaching at Corinth were given by God to confirm that he was preaching God's truth.

Paul understood the idea of the Spirit and particularly the Spirit's oneness with God mainly from the Old Testament and from pre-Pauline Christian thinking (which was similar to the Old Testament teaching on the Spirit but Christ-related). However, to the Corinthians he explained the idea of the Spirit mainly in terms of the human spirit. Rather than regarding the Spirit as similar to the free-acting spirits in the world, he spoke of the Spirit-in-revelation as invisible, unknowable and embodied like the human spirit, acting within the confines of a body. This body may be the individual Christian (6:19) or the corporate body of Christ, the Church (3:16). For nowhere in his writings did he speak of the Spirit acting "in the world" rather than in a body. This resulted in him speaking of the

Spirit's creative work as similarly confined. To Paul "pneuma" had much the same meaning in the term "Spirit of God" as in the term "spirit of man". Thus, the vast gulf between the expressions "Spirit of God" and "spirit of man" does not lie in the term "pneuma", but in the "of God" and "of man" which make the two expressions very different. Just as he used "spirit of man" to refer to man's inner self, so he thought of the Spirit as God's self or presence within the believer and within the Church. Thus in receiving God's Spirit, the believer shares in God's knowledge of Himself, for revelation is not so much God passing on knowledge to man as the coming of God to man, not through the Spirit but as the Spirit. Thus Paul does not say God is Spirit, since the word "Spirit", for Paul, does not express the nature of God as much as the relationship of God with believers. Thus the Spirit-in-revelation is not simply God's presence, but God's presence within a body singular or corporate. When writing to the Corinthians, and we may also say in his other letters, Paul regarded the Spirit's unity with God (the starting point for all his thinking about the Spirit's nature) as more basic than the Spirit's relationship with Christ. Whilst it is true that the emphasis on the Spirit's unity with God is to be found mainly in 1 Corinthians Chapter 1-4 (where God is being particularly stressed), it seems clear that Paul regarded the unity as an essential one.

When Paul described his readers as a "temple" he again reminded them that the indwelling Spirit was truly God's presence

within and among them. But because of the over-emphasis in Corinth on the indwelling of the Spirit, Paul stressed the Lordship of Christ as judge rather than speaking of the Spirit's activity within the believer opposing the flesh and motivating ethical behaviour.

The Messianic Age of the Spirit had dawned in which Christ, now freed from the confines of space and time exercised his Lordship. However Paul in 1 Corinthians did not speak of this Lordship operating directly through the Spirit but instead through God's power and through His servants. Thus, the Spirit's activity, in relation to the risen Lord, is to reveal the words and actions of the historic Christ and, in the light of these words and actions, to interpret the new circumstances to the believer.

To Paul the missionary and apostle, the theory and practice of baptism were unimportant compared with the preaching, in the power of the Spirit, of the message of Christ crucified. However, if an appeal to the meaning of baptism or to a further understanding of the Spirit (2:10-16) served his evangelistic or pastoral aims, then he used it. Thus, the fact that he made no mention in 1 Corinthians, or in any of his other letters that the Spirit was given in baptism, not only indicates that he did not hold such a view, but demonstrates again that for Paul the concept of the Spirit belonged intimately with the whole dynamic process of and acceptance of the preaching of the gospel. To correct the view of some of the Corinthians who appear to have

thought that only those with the gift of tongues had the Spirit, Paul affirmed clearly (12:1-3) that the true test for the Spirit's presence was confession of Christ as Lord. He went a step further and stated that all who could make such a confession, no matter what kind of gifts they possessed, had received the Spirit - the one Spirit. Thus the body of Christ was indwelt by the one Spirit and it shared a spiritual unity of experience (12:13) - conversion, receiving the Spirit, baptism into one group and further experience of the Spirit (12:13).

When the statements about the Spirit in 1 Corinthians are compared with Paul's other letters, it is soon apparent that many ideas about the Spirit in the other letters are not present in 1 Corinthians. For example, there is no mention of the Spirit resurrecting, being a guide, helping the Christian, or being a guarantee. Also, there is almost no mention of the Spirit performing any present or future activities within the believer. In fact, most references to the Spirit's activity are in the past tense. This is probably not due so much to lack of development in Paul's thinking, to lack of space in his letters, or to an imminent expectation of the parousia, as to deliberate omissions. The Corinthians had so over-emphasised the Spirit's indwelling and His miraculous manifestations and at the same time severed their thinking about the Spirit from God and Christ crucified, that Paul purposely omitted to mention the Spirit's present activities within the believer to direct their allegiance and attention to Christ and God. Thus the ethical teaching in 1 Corinthians is basically "obey the

Lord who is coming in judgment" and not "follow the Spirit". Therefore Paul limited himself to statements such as "your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit" (6:19) which implied "therefore be holy".

Since many studies of Pauline theology in the past have not given sufficient emphasis to the Sitz im Leben of Paul's statements we have attempted to do this in our study. From the evidence in 1 Corinthians, and bearing in mind that it is a real letter written by a missionary attempting to be "all things to all men", we conclude that Paul did not have an absolute and fixed use of πνεῦμα for Spirit of God. Thus in 2:4 he used πνεῦμα to refer to the Spirit of God in a general historic way and in 15:45 πνεῦμα did not refer to the Spirit directly for it seems to mean "heavenly existence". However, he did have a fixed idea of what "Spirit of God" means: the invisible presence of God which indwells a believing body (σῶμα) both individually and corporately.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allan, J. A. The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, (Lon.) 1951.

- The Epistle to the Ephesians, (Lon.) 1959.

Allo, E.-B. Première Épître aux Corinthiens, (Paris) 1956.

- "Sagesse et Pneuma dans la Première Épître aux Corinthiens", R B, 43, (1934) pp. 321-346.

Anderson, H. and Barclay, W. The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective, (Oxf.) 1965.

Ayles, H. H. B. "2 Corinthians 3:17", E T, 21, (1909-10) pp. 90-91.

Badcock, F. J. "'The Spirit' and Spirit in the N.T.", E T, 45, (1934) pp. 218-221.

Barnikol, E. Die Vor-und Frühchristliche Zeit das Paulus, (Keil) 1929.

Barr, J. The Semantics of Biblical Language, (Lon.) 1961.

Barrett, C. K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, (N.Y. and Lon.) 1947.

- (Ed.) The New Testament Background: Selected Documents, (Lon.) 1961.
- From First Adam to Last, (Lon.) 1962.
- The Epistle to the Romans, (Lon.) 1962.
- The Gospel According to St John, (Lon.) 1962.
- "Christianity at Corinth", B J R L, Vol. 46, 2, (March 1964) pp. 269-297.
- "Things Sacrificed to Idols", N T S, 11, (Jan. 1965) pp. 138-153.
- A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, (Lon.) 1968.

- "The Holy Spirit", A B R, Vol. 18, (Oct. 1970) pp. 1-9.

Barth, K. The Epistle to the Romans, (Lon.) 1933.

- The Resurrection of the Dead, (Lon.) 1933.

- A Shorter Commentary on Romans, (Lon.) 1959.

- The Epistle to the Philippians, (Lon.) 1962.

Barth, M. "The Challenge of the Apostle Paul", J E S, 1, (1,1964) pp.58-87.

- "The Kerygma of Galatians", Interp, 21, (1967) pp. 131-146.

Bauer, J. B. Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology, (Lon.) 1970.

Bauer, W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Tr.- W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, (Chic.) 1957.

Beare, F. W. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, (Lon.) 1959.

- "Speaking With Tongues", J B L, 83, (3, 1964) pp. 229-246.

Behm, J. ἀρραβών , article in T W N T.

- καρδία , article in T W N T.

Best, E. One Body in Christ (Lon.) 1955.

Bittlinger, A. Gifts and Graces, (Lon.) 1967.

Boers, H. W. "Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Cor. 15" Interp, 21, (1967) pp. 50-65.

Bornkamm, G. μυστήριον , article in T W N T.

Boyd, R. F. "The Work of the Holy Spirit in Prayer; an Exposition of Romans 8:26, 27", Interp, 8, (1954) pp. 35-42.

Bromily, G. W. "The Spirit of Christ" in Essays in Christology for Karl Barth, (Lon.) 1956.

Bruce, F. F. The Book of the Acts, (Lon.) 1954.

- The Acts of the Apostles, (Lon.) 1962.

- 1 and 2 Corinthians, (Lon.) 1971.

Brunner, E. The Letter to the Romans, (Lon.) 1959.

Bultmann, R. Gnosis, Bible Key Words from T W N T, (Lon.) 1952.

- The Theology of the New Testament, Vol. 1, (Lon.) 1952.
- Primitive Christianity In Its Contemporary Setting, (N.Y.) 1956.
- ζάω , article in T W N T.

Burton, E. de W. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to the Galatians, (Edin.) 1921.

Calvin, J. The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, (Edin. and Lon.) 1960.

- The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians, (Lon.) 1961.
- The Epistles of Paul to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians, (Edin. and Lon.) 1965.

Cerfaux, L. Christ in the Theology of St. Paul, (Lon. and N.Y.) 1959.

- The Church in the Theology of St. Paul, (N.Y.) 1959.

Chadwick, H. "'All Things to All Men' (1 Cor. IX.22)", N T S, 1, (1955) pp. 261-275.

Clements, R. E. God and Temple, (Oxf.) 1965.

Cohen, B. "Note on Letter and Spirit in the N.T.", H T R, 47, (1954) pp. 197-203.

Conzelmann, H. "Paulus und die Weisheit", N T S, 12, (1966) pp. 231-244.

Cranfield, C. E. B. "St. Paul and the Law" in New Testament Issues (Ed.) R. Batey, (Lon.) 1970.

Cullmann, O. Baptism in the New Testament, (Lon.) 1950.

- Christ and Time, (Lon.) 1951.
- The Christology of the New Testament, (Lon.) 1959.
- Early Christian Worship, (Lon.) 1962.

Dahl, M. E. The Resurrection of the Body, S B T, 36, (Lon.) 1962.

Dahl, N. A. "Paul and the Church at Corinth According to 1 Corinthians 1:10 - 4:21" in Christian History and Interpretation, (Ed.) W. R. Farmer et al, (Camb.) 1967, pp. 313-335.

Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, (Lon.) 1948.

"Paul and the D.S.S." in The Scrolls and the New Testament, (Lon.) 1958.

- Christian Origins and Judaism, (Lon.) 1962.

Deissmann, G. A. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History, (Lon.) 1926.

- Light From the Ancient East, (N.Y.) 1927.

Deluz, G. A Companion to 1 Corinthians, (Lon.) 1963.

Dibelius, M. and Kümmel, W. G. Paul, (Lon.) 1953.

Dodd, C. H. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, (Lon.) 1944.

- New Testament Studies, (Man.) 1953.
- According to the Scriptures, (Lon.) 1957.
- The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, (Lon.) 1959.
- More New Testament Studies, (Man.) 1968.

Duncan, G. S. The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, (Lon.) 1934.

Dunn, J. D. G. Baptism in the Holy Spirit, S B T, 15, (Lon.) 1970.

Dupont, J. The Sources of Acts, (Lon.) 1964.

Edwards, T. C. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, (Lon.) 1885.

Ellis, E. E. Paul's Use of the Old Testament, (Edin.) 1957.

- Paul and His Recent Interpreters, (Mich.) 1961.

Enslin, M. S. The Ethics of Paul, (N.Y.) 1957.

Evans, E. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, (Oxf.) 1930.

Farmer, W. R. (Ed. et al.) Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox, (Camb.) 1967.

Faw, C. E. "The Anomaly of Galatians", B R, 4, (1960) pp. 25-38.

Findlay, G. G. The Epistles to the Thessalonians with Introduction Notes and Map, (Camb.) 1891.

Flew, R. N. Jesus and His Church, (Lon.) 1939.

Foerster, W. κύριος , article in T W N T.

Frame, G. E. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, (Edin.) 1912.

Furnish, V. P. Theology and Ethics in Paul, (N.Y.) 1968.

Gager, J. G. "Functional Diversity in Paul's Use of End-Time Language", J B L, 89, (Sept. 1970) pp. 325 - 337.

Glen, J. S. Pastoral Problems in First Corinthians, (Lon.) 1965.

Godet, F. Commentary on St Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, (Edin.) 1893.

Goudge, H. L. The First Epistle to the Corinthians with Introduction and Notes, (Lon.) 1911.

Grant, R. M. Gnosticism and Early Christianity, (Oxf. and N.Y.) 1959.

Grundmann, W. δύναμαι , δύναμις , article in T W N T.

Guthrie, D. New Testament Introduction - The Pauline Epistles, (Lon.) 1961.

- Hebrews to Revelation, (Lon.) 1962.

- The Gospels and Acts, (Lon.) 1965.

Hamilton, N. Q. The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Paper 6, (Edin. and Lon.) 1957.

Hanson, R. P. C. 2 Corinthians, (Lon.) 1954.

Harris, R. J. "A Quotation from Judith in the Pauline Epistles", E T, 27, (1915-1916) pp. 13-15.

Héring, J. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, (Lon.) 1962.

Hermann, I. Kyrios und Pneuma, (Mün.) 1961.

Hester, J. D. Paul's Concept of Inheritance, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Paper 14, (Edin. and Lon.) 1968.

Hill, D. Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, (Camb.) 1967.

Hoyle, R. B. "Spirit in St. Paul's Experience and Writings", B R, 11, (1926) pp. 474-507.

- The Holy Spirit in St. Paul, (Lon.) 1927.

Hughes, H. M. "2 Cor. 3:17:- ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν ", E T, 45, (1933-1934) pp. 235-236.

Hughes, P. E. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, (Lon. and Edin.) 1962.

Hull, J. H. E. The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles, (Lon.) 1967.

Hunter, A. M. Paul and His Predecessors, (Lon.) 1961.

Hurd, J. C. The Origin of 1 Corinthians, (Lon.) 1965.

- "Pauline Chronology and Pauline Theology" in Christian History and Interpretation, (Camb.) 1967, pp. 225-248.

Jeremias, J. "The Key to Pauline Theology", E T, 76, (1964) pp. 27-30.

- Abba, (Gott.) 1966.

Käsemann, E. Perspectives on Paul, (Lon.) 1969.

Keck, L. E. and Martin, L. J. (Ed.) Studies in Luke-Acts, (Lon.) 1968.

Kennedy, H. A. A. "St. Paul's Conception of the Spirit as a Pledge", Exp, 6th Series, 4, (1901) pp. 274-280.

- St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things, (Lon.) 1904.

- The Theology of the Epistles, (Lon.) 1919.

Kijne, J. J. "We, Us and Our in 1 and 11 Corinthians", N T, 8, (April 1966) pp. 171-179.

Kirby, J. C. Ephesians Baptism and Pentecost, (Lon.) 1968.

Kittel, G. (Ed.) Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, E.T. of T.W.N.T. by G. W. Bromiley (Mich.) 1965ff.

Knox, J. Chapters in a Life of Paul, (Lon.) 1954.

Knox, W. L. St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, (Camb.) 1925.

- St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, (Camb.) 1939.

Kramer, W. Christ, Lord, Son of God, S B T, 50, (Lon.) 1966.

Kümmel, W. G. Man in the New Testament, (Lon.) 1963.

- Introduction to the New Testament, (Lon.) 1966.

Künneth, W. The Theology of the Resurrection, (Lon.) 1965.

Lake, K. and Cadbury, H. J. The Beginnings of Christianity, Part 1, The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. 4, (Lon.) 1933.

Lampe, G. W. H. The Seal of the Spirit, (Lon.) 1967.

Leaney, A. R. C. "The Doctrine of Man in 1 Corinthians", S J T, 15, 4, pp. 394-399.

Leenhardt, F. J. The Epistle to the Romans, (Lon.) 1961.

Lightfoot, R. H. The Epistle to the Galatians, (Lon.) 1890.

Luck, U. "Historische Fragen zum Verhältnis von Kyrios und Pneuma bei Paulus, T L Z, 11, (1960) pp. 845-848.

McArthur, H. K. "Computer Criticism", E T, (Sept. 1965) pp. 367-370.

- "A Further Note on Paul and the Computers", E T, (Aug. 1966) p. 350.

McKelvey, R. J. The New Temple, (Oxf.) 1969.

Manson, T. W. "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans and Others", B J R L, 31, (1948) pp. 224-240.

- Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, (Man.) 1962.

- On Paul and John, (Lon.) 1963.

Manson, W. et al. Eschatology, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Paper 2, (Lon.) 1952.

Martin, D. W. "'Spirit' in the Second Chapter of First Corinthians", C B Q, 5, (1943) pp. 381-395.

Michel, O. νεός , article in T W N T.

Milligan, G. St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, (Lon.) 1908.

Minear, P. S. Images of the Church in the New Testament, (Lon.) 1961.

Mitton, C. L. The Formation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters, (Lon.) 1955.

Moffatt, J. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, (Lon.) 1938.

Montefiore, C. G. Judaism and St. Paul, (Lon.) 1914.

Moore, A. L. The Parousia in the New Testament, (Leiden) 1966.

Moore, G. F. Judaism, (3 vols.) (Oxf.) 1927-30.

Morris, L. The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, (Lon.) 1956.

- The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, (Lon.) 1958.

Morton, A. Q. "The Authorship of the Pauline Corpus" in The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective, (Ed) H. Anderson et al, (Oxf.) 1965.

- "Computer Criticism - A Reply", E T, (Jan. 1966) pp. 116-120.
- and McLeman, J. Paul, the Man and the Myth, (Lon.) 1966.

Moule, C. F. D. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon, (Camb.) 1957.

- An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek, (Camb.) 1959.
- "The Influence of Circumstances On the Use of Eschatological Terms", J T S, 15, (N.S.), (April 1964) pp. 1-15.
- "A Reconsideration of the Context of Maranatha", N T S, 6, pp. 307-310.
- "St Paul and Dualism: The Pauline Conception of Resurrection", N T S, 12, pp. 106-123.

Moulton, J. H. Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. III, (Edin.) 1963.

Munck, J. Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, (Lon.) 1959.

Neil, W. The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, (Lon.) 1950.

Nock, A. D. St Paul, (Lon.) 1946.

Oke, C. C. "Paul's Method not a Demonstration but an Exhibition of the Spirit", E T, 67, (1955-56) pp. 35, 36.

- "A Suggestion with Regard to Romans 8:23", Interp, 11, (1957) pp. 455-460.

Oepke, A. βάπτω , article in T W N T.

O'Neill, J. C. The Theology of Acts, (Lon.) 1961.

Pfister, W. Das Leben im Geist nach Paulus, (Freiburg) 1963.

Pinnock, C. H. The Concept of Spirit in the Epistles of Paul, (Ph.D. Diss. Man.) 1962-3.

Prat, F. The Theology of St. Paul, (Lon.) 1926.

Ramsay, A. M. The Resurrection of Christ, (Lon.) 1945.

Richardson, A. (Ed.) A Theological Word Book of the Bible, (Lon.) 1950.

- An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, (Lon.) 1958.

Robertson, A. and Plummer, A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, (Edin.) 1967.

Robinson, J. A. T. The Body, S B T, (Lon.) 1961.

Sanday, W. and Headlam, A. C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, (Edin.) 1914.

Sasse, H. αἰών , article in T W N T.

Schlier, H. ἐλεύθερος , article in T W N T.

Schnackenburg, R. God's Rule and Kingdom, (Lon.) 1963.

- Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul, (Oxf.) 1964.

- The Church in the New Testament, (Lon.) 1965.

- The Moral Teaching of the New Testament, (Lon.) 1967.

Schneider, B. "The Meaning of Paul's Antithesis 'The Letter and the Spirit'", C B Q, 15, (1953) pp. 163-207.

Schoeps, H. J. Paul, (Lon.) 1961.

Schweitzer, A. Paul and His Interpreters, (Lon.) 1912.

- The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, (Lon.) 1931.

Schweizer, E. et al. πνεῦμα , article in T W N T.

- et al. Spirit of God, Bible Key Words from T W N T, (Lon.) 1960.

- Neotestamentica, (Zür. and Stutt.) 1963.

Scott, C. A. A. Footnotes to St. Paul, (Camb.) 1935.

- Christianity According to St. Paul, (Camb.) 1939.

Scott, E. F. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, (Lon.) 1923.

Scroggs, R. "Paul: ΣΟΦΟΣ and ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ", N T S, 14, (1967-68) pp. 33-55.

Shedd, R. P. Man in Community, (Lon.) 1958.

Simon, G. The First Epistle to the Corinthians, (Lon.) 1959.

Simon, M. "The Apostolic Decree and Its Setting in the Ancient Church", B J R L, Vol. 52, 2, (Spring 1970), pp. 437-460.

Stalder, K. Das Werk des Geistes in der Heiligung bei Paulus, (Bern) 1962.

Stauffer, E. New Testament Theology (N.Y.) 1956.

Swete, H. B. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, (Lon.) 1910.

Thiselton, A. C. Eschatology and the Holy Spirit in Paul with Special Reference to 1 Corinthians, (M. Th. Diss. L.K.C.) 1963-64.

Van Unnik, W. C. Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings, S B T, 30, (Lon.) 1960.

- Tarsus or Jerusalem, (Lon.) 1962.

Vermes, G. (Tr.) The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, (Harmondsworth) 1966.

Vos, G. The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit, (N.Y.) 1912.

- The Pauline Eschatology, (Michigan) 1961.

Wagner, G. Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries, (Lon.) 1967.

Walker, D. The Gift of Tongues, (Edin.) 1906.

Weiss, J. Earliest Christianity, Vol. 1, (N.Y.) 1959.

- Earliest Christianity, Vol. 2, (N.Y.) 1965.

Wendland, H. D. "Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes in den Gläubigen nach Paulus", T L Z, 77, (1952) pp. 457-470.

Wheeler Robinson, H. The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit, (Lon.) 1928.

Whiteley, D. E. H. The Theology of St. Paul, (Lon.) 1964.

Wilckens, U. Weisheit und Torheit, (Tüb.) 1959.

Williams, C. S. C. The Acts of the Apostles, (Lon.) 1964.

Wilson, R. McL. The Gnostic Problem, (Lon.) 1958.

- Gnosis and the New Testament, (Oxf.) 1968.

Winstanley, E. W. Spirit in the New Testament, (Camb.) 1908.