

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## One Body in Christ, Rom. xii., 1 Cor. xii.

PROF. FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

MEADVILLE, PA.

I WISH to argue that τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον = τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and that the same thing is meant by τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, in the natural sense of 'body,' and not in the mystic sense of 'church.' More accurately τὸ πνεῦμα is the heavenly substance of the form of the risen Christ.

Adolf Deissmann, in his investigation of the formula ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, reaches the conclusion that ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι means a dwelling of the Christian locally within the risen pneumatic Christ. This expression of intimate union with Christ is made intelligible by the help of another idea, namely, ἐν πνεύματι εἶναι = dwelling in a pneuma-element which is comparable to an air, an atmosphere. The apparent stringency of Deissmann's argument has since been weakened by Dr. Johannes Weiss in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1896, Erstes Heft. Dr. Weiss shows that in many of the passages we are free to depart from the sense of 'locality within.' At the same time, he admits the explanation for many passages, and with Deissmann holds that the clue to this mental image is the identification of Christ and the Spirit (2 Cor. 3<sup>17</sup>). "This equivalence of the ascended Lord with the divine πνεῦμα, which is nevertheless in some fashion or other conceived as material, impersonal, has for its inevitable result that the personal image (Vorstellung) of the Lord is here and there overbid by the other impersonal idea. Deissmann draws attention to the formula Χριστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι. Certainly this is not meant as figure but in strict sense. Yet Paul would not have been able to choose this expression, if at that moment there had hovered distinctly before him the picture of the personal Lord who hears prayers and answers them, who frames his purposes of redemption and with the strong hand of love brings them to pass. At such a moment Christ must really have coalesced with the πνεῦμα as with an impersonal element." Dr. Weiss adds that while Paul himself may not have recognized the disparity of the ideas, the shift of imagery must

nevertheless have occurred, so that the thought of the risen Lord thus received a pantheistic nuance.

My reading of Paul makes it impossible for me to believe that in so bold a phrase as *Χριστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι* we have any fading out of the Lord's personality into a diffused pervasive energy. What suggests the 'pantheistic nuance'? It is the idea of the Spirit as an atmosphere or influence, — whether or not conceived as material, — which proceeds from the risen Christ and permeates the Church on earth. But did Paul so conceive the Spirit? That is the prior question. We have been very naturally led to believe that he did. It is the notion given us by the Acts of the Apostles. The Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, moreover, represent Christ as the head to which the Church is related as the body, and conceive of Christ's action on the body by aid of the further notion of the operations of the indwelling Spirit (Eph. 2<sup>22</sup> 3<sup>16</sup>). On grounds unrelated to this topic these Epistles are assigned to another hand. I hold the view of Holtzmann. That the Church is an organism of redeemed humanity, that it is the body of Christ, may be congruous enough with the thought of Paul, but in the Epistle to the Ephesians it seems to be presented as a new, fresh insight finding here its first explicit utterance. Under the influence of this Epistle we ordinarily find the idea in Rom. 12 and 1 Cor. 12, where the equation is not made. It would certainly seem that the thought of the Church in its unity as the body of Christ remained inactive in Paul's mind. Only in the deutero-Pauline Epistles does it receive the expansion and emphasis which belongs to so important a conception. Nor is it certain that the conception was Paul's at all. No use of the word 'Church' in the undisputed Epistles need apply to all the Christians of the world collectively. In 1 Cor. 12<sup>28</sup> I find only the assembly for worship. Philippians 3<sup>6</sup>, 'persecuting the Church,' and Gal. 1<sup>13</sup>, 1 Cor. 15<sup>9</sup>, 'persecuting the Church of God,' suggest only the local church or churches which Paul did actually persecute. The added *τοῦ θεοῦ* only brings out the enormity of the act. Nothing suggests that the Church figured in Paul's mind as the earthly anticipation of the Kingdom of God, and for the age after Advent the Church is not mentioned.

And yet readers of the interesting book by Kabisch, *Die Eschatologie des Paulus*, will recall that the *Parousia* of Christ, the head, is also the *Parousia* of his marvelous body which is composed of glorified Christians (pp. 282 ff.). To Kabisch 'body' means 'body,' and 'spirit' is for him a substance, and the result is a picture of the Day

of Advent which for grotesque suggestion is not surpassed by the fantastic efforts of the Elkesaites as recorded by Epiphanius. Nevertheless I regard Kabisch as justified in thinking of πνεῦμα as substantial and the body of Christ as literally the body. I wish only to escape his bewildering results and solve the other problem which has been raised.

The question is: Did Paul have the conception of the Holy Spirit which we find in the Book of Acts? If he did, how, then, could he conceivably be said to identify Christ and the Spirit? In 2 Cor. 3<sup>17</sup> the identity is declared; but immediately, by the words πνεῦμα κυρίου, a distinction is implied. What is this relation which is almost identity? That there is substantially identification and yet an inexact identification may be argued in another way. Phrases like 'in the Spirit,' 'the Spirit in us,' are freely used as equivalents of 'in Christ,' 'Christ in us.' The one thing here which readers have found sharply expressed is the personal union of the Christian with his Lord. That mystic fusion of personalities would seem to be the certain thing, the known thing in Paul's system; yet surely the mystic union is only a figure of speech, if we may so freely say the same thing by mentioning an influence or emanation of Christ in us. If we are to cling to this thought of the personal merging of self in Christ, we may not argue that Paul's mental image becomes impersonal and pantheistic when he expresses the idea by 'the Spirit in us.' The inference should be that πνεῦμα is imaged as personal, limited, anthropomorphic. We should conclude that an almost complete identification is possible because the Spirit is for the imagination coterminous with the figure of the risen Lord. We ought to drop the notion that the Spirit is a different energy from Christ, constituting his body, the Church. We must decide that the Spirit constitutes his body in the literal sense, the personal form of the risen Lord. It is the heavenly substance of the heavenly man. This is the inexact identification to be established. We note, therefore, that the undoubted Epistles do not, in express words, identify Christ's body and the Church, and we seek an interpretation for those passages which, read under the influence of Ephesians, seem to express such an identity.

*The risen Lord is a pneumatic being.* This is a matter of agreement. He is the first fruits of the resurrection, the first to wear the σῶμα πνευματικόν. The form he wore in his heavenly preëxistence, ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων (Phil. 2<sup>6</sup>), can hardly have been a different thing in view of the general equivalence of μορφή, εἰκών, and σῶμα. Compare Rom. 8<sup>29</sup>, συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, and Phil.

3<sup>21</sup>, *σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι*. The substance of the preëxistent bodily form was *πνεῦμα*. Rom. 8<sup>3</sup>, I Cor. 15<sup>45</sup>, 2 Cor. 8<sup>9</sup>, justify the language of 2 Clement 9<sup>5</sup>: *ὡν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον πνεῦμα ἐγένετο σὰρξ*. So in I Cor. 10, the drinking of water in the desert—actual water unless we fancy Paul to have ignored the literal sense—was also the draught of a spiritual gift from the very nature of the Christ not yet made flesh. In any case the risen Lord is imaged in a body (2 Cor. 4<sup>4</sup>), and that body is composed of *πνεῦμα*, for it is celestial; “as we wore the image of the earthly, we shall also wear the image of the celestial” (I Cor. 15<sup>40</sup>). The rest of I Cor. 15 shows that the Christian’s *σῶμα πνευματικόν* is to be invested with *δόξα* and *δύναμις*, that divine lustre and transforming power by which the Lord’s body assimilates others to itself (Phil. 13<sup>21</sup>). This is not more nor less than is guaranteed to the Christian by present possession of the Holy Spirit. Why then should we conceive the Holy Spirit as anything distinct from Christ’s body of *πνεῦμα*? The latter merits the term ‘holy.’ It has the *δόξα θεοῦ*, the *δύναμις θεοῦ* (Phil. 3<sup>21</sup>). The *εἰκὼν* is the *εἰκὼν θεοῦ* (2 Cor. 4<sup>4</sup>). That he is now a being of *holy* spirit is moreover made distinct in Rom. 1<sup>36</sup>. By bodily descent on earth as a man of flesh he was Son of David. Resurrection installed him as Son of God *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης*. Surely the substance of his risen personality is meant and the genitive is adjectival in value. [Contra B. Weiss. See Gunkel’s *Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, p. 104.]

The risen Christ, then, has a holy spiritual form, and the Christian’s consummation is to be conformed to it, so as to wear the image and the glory of God. In that heavenly future there is no mention of the *ἐκκλησία*, no mention of the Holy Spirit as distinct from Christ’s own personal nature. The final picture is only complete, personal identification of individual men with the Lord by conformity to his holy body.

This becomes a natural mode of thought as we note that *σῶμα carries the idea of personality*. The Hebrew mind thinks by pictures where the heirs of Greek philosophic culture think by concepts, and we may not weigh and value Paul’s mental representations by the meanings which belong to modern pictures in our own minds. For us a concrete image is an assistance to fancy, an inadequate illustration, while the religious *truth* finds its proper statement in highly abstract terms. “To-day,” says Harnack (*Dogmengeschichte*, i<sup>2</sup>. 397), “we understand by symbol a thing which is not that which it signifies. Then, in many circles at least, men understood by symbol a thing which in some sense or other really is that which it signifies.” Paul

and John are not to be read by the same canon. For the former, the concrete elements in expressions of the supersensible had not faded into metaphor. For him 'body' and 'spirit' are not related to 'personality' as image to reality. The image and the reality are one. In our weaker abstract language we describe the human goal as complete self-realization. Paul's image is human coalescence in the ideal equality of Christ. We shall be like him. Only so can we think the state where God shall be all in all. The passionate insistence of 1 Cor. 15 upon the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* shows that what we call personal continuance could not dispense with the picture of an organic form. Not only shape but substance also has values for him which we have dropped. That, too, is necessary to the notion 'person.' An unredeemed self is one in which the evil seated in the garment of fleshly substance tyrannizes over the rational will (*νοῦς*). The final, complete redemption is to have a form consisting of such a substance as contains no hindrance to the will's compliance with the nature of God in Christ, or the heart's delight in Him. The idea is expressed by 'the inner man.' This itself can be pictured. As *σῶμα* is only organic shape, we may imagine the human *πνεῦμα*, given by the breath of God, as filling that frame. Speaking of the selfhood of Christ Paul cannot say inner man, for there is no outer man of flesh. He need only say body or spirit, and it is more important that he should say spirit. The rabbinical counterpart of *σῶμα* (שׂוּמָה) meant not only the opposite of soul, but also person (Wuenschel, *Neue Beiträge*, etc., p. 331).

We have come to a notion of the Holy Spirit as almost identical with Christ and quite free from the pantheistic nuance. The world to come seems to need no other. But what of the present world? Is there a separate resting place for thought and veneration when Paul speaks of the present Holy Spirit? Is there another spirit poured out on earth as an effluence of energy from Christ, an hypostasis commissioned by him? What is it that interferes with the thought of the Christian as having a coalescence of self with the risen Lord? It is that which makes the mystic union of two selves relax into a life in the same 'atmosphere.' It is the notion of the Holy Spirit as constituting another body of Christ, which is only figuratively a body, the Church. I wish to approach the passages in Rom. 12 and 1 Cor. 12 so as to dispense with this idea of the Church as the body of Christ.

*Paul's notion of redemption supports the view.* The heavenly future is clear. We shall be like him. We shall be conformed to

his glorious body (Phil. 3<sup>21</sup>). We shall be sons of God as he now, risen from the dead, by virtue of his being of Holy Spirit, is Son of God (Rom. 1<sup>4</sup>). In Augustine's language we shall be not Christians but Christ. *Ut, quod perdideramus in Adam, i.e. secundum imaginem et similitudinem esse dei, hoc in Christo Jesu reciperemus* (Iren. iii. 18, 1). We have to deal, however, with the present proleptic redemption. It is expressed indifferently, 'be in Christ,' 'Christ in me,' 'in the Spirit,' 'the Spirit in me.' All mean to be a new creature. I must treat it as an established fact that 'the Spirit in us' is for Paul more than an ethical reality. The new life is new existence, new being, as well as new character. In Rom. 6, the future union by likeness of his resurrection has a present basis in our possession of the Spirit. The body of sin = the sinful body = the fleshly personality, is annulled, for we have shared in Christ's death. We are now able to live for God (vs.<sup>10</sup>), because a new medium of life is imparted, which is victorious over hindrance. This more than volitional newness of life is here only expressed by *ζώντας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. This is such a local personal union that he uses our limbs as *ἄλλα δικαιοσύνης* (vs.<sup>13</sup>). When, however, the thought is repeated in ch. 7, it is a *καινότης τοῦ πνεύματος*. The close of 7 and the opening verses of 8 contrast the tyranny of the flesh with the freedom of the new-given Spirit, a gift which is one thing with 'in Christ Jesus.' The Christian is not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God house in him. The unredeemed man is tenanted by sin and death, because his shape, his *σῶμα*, is clothed with fleshly substance. The redeemed man has the Spirit of Christ (vs.<sup>9</sup>); Christ is in him (<sup>10</sup>). His *σῶμα* is now a corpse (*νεκρόν*), — in the sense that the *flesh* is annulled, — but the *πνεῦμα* is *ζωή*. This identification with Christ, which is a housing of his divine Spirit in us, is also the present proof of the resurrection of the *σῶμα*, — *διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικούντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν* (<sup>11</sup>). True the Spirit is not named the body of Christ, but we certainly pass very easily from the indwelling of the Spirit to the future, *ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος*, a ransoming *of*, not *from* (cf. 1 Cor. 15), which is the full freedom of the glory of the children of God (<sup>21</sup>), the manifestation of the sons of God in the *δόξα* and *δύναμις* belonging now only to the risen archetypal Son of God, belonging to his body and thence to be conferred on ours so that we shall be conformed to the image of his Son (<sup>20</sup>). At present, in place of *δόξα*, there is *ἀσθένεια* (<sup>28</sup>), for which the Spirit has compassion. Then, we shall be raised in glory and power (1 Cor. 15<sup>42f.</sup>). It does not seem an arbitrary thing,

therefore, to image the present Spirit in us as a blending with his body, the clothing of our *σῶμα* (in terms of the inner man) with that which makes his personality. So the "born after the spirit" of Gal. 4<sup>20</sup> is only a repetition of Gal. 4<sup>19</sup>, "until Christ be *formed* in you."

This association of ideas is more conspicuous in 2 Cor. 4 and 5. The *ἀραβὼν τοῦ πνεύματος* (5<sup>5</sup>) is a pledge that we shall not be found *naked* at death. Without waiting for the Advent we shall be immediately clothed with a heavenly house. In the present our wish is not to put off the body (*i.e.* of flesh), but to draw on over us the new body in order that what is mortal (flesh) may be swallowed up of life. This vanishing of the flesh in the deathless element, which with it clothes our shape, is, indeed, a truth of faith (?); for when at home in the body (of flesh) we walk in a realm of faith, not of seeing. What we shall *see* at Advent is told us in Phil. 3<sup>21</sup>. Just because the present is not a time of seeing, Paul lets *σῶμα* remain a suggestion of flesh, and expresses the new creature, not in terms of perceptible form, but of the unseen essence of spirit. Even here, however, where the word is spirit, the thought of body has just been present to mind. After the incomplete identification of the Lord and the Spirit in 2 Cor. 3<sup>17</sup>, we have immediately (1<sup>8</sup>): "we all, with unveiled face mirroring the *δόξα* of the Lord, are being metamorphosed into the same *εἰκῶν*, from *δόξα* to *δόξα* (from one degree of divine manifestation to another), even by the Lord's spirit" [so, contra Schmiedel, *ad loc.* *Lord's* emphasized, since the glory of God belongs to the *Lord's εἰκῶν*]. The final transformation of Phil. 3<sup>21</sup> has already begun with the present possession of the Lord's spirit. As yet, it is incomplete, for where there is flesh, there is weakness (cf. 2 Cor. 13<sup>4</sup>). Theoretically annulled, the flesh is actually only dying, and this gradual death is spoken of in close succession. The shining of Christ, God's image, in our hearts is the life of Jesus in us, a treasure in a vessel of earth, a life in our flesh (inside our flesh? 4<sup>7</sup>), and this is as real as the dying of Jesus, which we bear about in the same body. This life is the Spirit in us (1<sup>8</sup>). In disagreement with Schmiedel, we understand *ἔχοντες τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως* (faith-given spirit) to mean 'the same Spirit in me as in you.' One *noumenon*, one new man, Christ, is manifested in them and in him; in him most notably as death, in them as life. Here, again, the inner transformation into Christ's form is the tenancing of his Spirit in man. The coalescence of Christ's nature (*πνεῦμα*) is with the inner man, so that while the flesh is dying away, the inner man is

renewed day by day (<sup>18</sup>). Shall we not think, then, that the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* is being built up in us, becoming more completely our inner self? The *σῶμα* as form is constant. That which changes is the substance. The flesh dies, the Spirit finally is seen in its place. But this is the Spirit of Christ fused with the human *πνεῦμα*, the inner man. Changing from substance to form, let us say it is the *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*. Just in proportion as *σῶμα* naturally suggests *σάρξ*, Paul naturally speaks of the *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*. This mode of interpretation requires that we should think of the human *πνεῦμα* as having bodily shape. Tertullian, at least, found this idea satisfactory (*De Anima*, ch. 9; cf. ch. 22) and applies Gen. 2<sup>7</sup> to an inner man completely filling the visible *σῶμα*, man being *duplíciter unus*.

Finally, this connection of ideas seems to be made conclusive by 1 Cor. 6<sup>13-20</sup>: The body for the Lord and the Lord for the body. This is not the Church. It is the individual, and body is meant in the natural sense. Paul passes at once to the idea of bodily resurrection (<sup>14</sup>). 'The Lord for the body — but this is not inclusive of flesh. He is for the inner man. To be joined to a harlot is to be one body with her, "for two, saith He, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit." The spirit received by the Christians, then, is embraced in the *σῶμα*, and it is for the Lord what flesh is for the woman: it is the substance which constitutes his body. The union with Christ, or Christ's spirit, is here imaged as the merging of two selves in one body. Your body — *i.e.* each body — is the temple of the Holy Spirit (<sup>19</sup>). This seems convincing proof that present redemption by the Holy Spirit is incorporation in Christ's body of spirit, the anticipation of that which shall be revealed and perfected at the *Parousia*.

*The eucharist is a reception of Christ's body of spirit.* Whether or not we have so far forced matters a little, the case gains in clearness when Paul expressly speaks of present union with the body of Christ. It is the Lord's body which is received in the eucharist, and it is a gift of *πνεῦμα*. In some divergence from 1 Cor. 11, the 10th chapter represents the taking of bread and wine as a reception of spiritual essence, and, at the same time, union with the body of Christ. There is a consubstantiation of bread and Christ, and of the Christian and Christ. The cup which we bless is *κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. The bread is *κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. A *real* fellowship with Christ is proven by the parallel case of eating meats known to be consecrated to demons (10<sup>20</sup>). The eater becomes a partner of the demonic being. Demonic possession would

not be a strained interpretation in view of 2 Cor. 6<sup>15 f.</sup>, where marriage with a pagan results in demonic possession. The synoptic language, *ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ*, may suggest a picture parallel to that which we argue for Paul's *ἐν πνεύματι Χριστοῦ*.

This eucharistic union with the body of Christ is a reception of his pneumatic being. The manna was a *πνευματικὸν βρῶμα*, and the water from the rock was a *πνευματικὸν πόμα*, and the rock *was* (not 'is' = signifies) Christ, the pneumatic Christ. (Spitta, i. 275 ff.; Kabisch, 202 ff.). These were types. Therefore, the eucharist conveys *πνεῦμα*. After the blessing, the bread and wine are *pneuma*, and, following the analogy of the rock, they are the *pneuma* of Christ, his nature, his body. As the charismata of the Holy Spirit are displayed in these eucharistic meetings (1 Cor. 12), we may infer that the eucharistic gift of Christ's spiritual body is the basis for these displays of spiritual gifts. Since, moreover, each Christian enters into union with Christ's pneumatic being, it follows that there is one body in many men. One person, Christ, enters into many persons as one inner self with them. Therefore, the language of vs.<sup>17</sup>: *εἰς ἄρτος* (loaf), *ἐν σώμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἴσμεν*. Spite of our multiplicity, we are one body, *οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν*. Though many, we are one and the same body, for the one bread is the nature of one being, Christ. The eucharist, then, is only an anticipation of the final conformity of all to his image. The insistence on *one* body is, so viewed, no reference to the Church as a body social. It is the same uncompromising identification of the individual Christian with Christ which we have in Gal. 3: *πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἑστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* (<sup>28</sup>) = *τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἑστὲ* (<sup>29</sup>) = *Χριστός* (<sup>17</sup>). Distinctions of male and female, Jew and Gentile, disappear. We are one new man, one body, one personality. We are being assimilated to the common ideal, the man from heaven. This is intelligible enough when we recall that Christ is not an individual among others. He is comparable to the Platonic archetypal man, the ideal pattern of humanity. Since no philosophic precision is ascribed to Paul, we may think also of the scholastic *universale ante rem* and the *universale in re*. He can be imaged in heaven, and yet he is in every Christian on earth. The world was on the eve of the *τέλος*, which is like the *ἀρχή* (cf. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 367-369).

*Application of this View to Rom. 12.*

"I beseech you, therefore, brethren, that ye present your bodies a living, holy, God-pleasing sacrifice" (<sup>1</sup>). The whole beautiful chap

ter is of what *we* call spiritual life. Since, however, form is necessary and permanent for man, Paul says bodies in place of 'lives,' but he thinks of body in terms of the inner man. The man of flesh is not holy or pleasing to God. It is the new creature, the body as temple of the Holy Spirit, the new life in Christ. At once, therefore, he urges them to attest the new metamorphosis in their rational choices, in the direction of the conscious life (<sup>2</sup>). The special intention of Paul, moreover, is to check arrogance and pretensions. There can be no exaltation of one person above another. One and the same person, Christ, is given to each and all. He expresses it here by *σῶμα* instead of *πνεῦμα*. We are all, though numerous, one body in Christ (<sup>3</sup>). The *σῶμα* has not changed its natural meaning since vs.<sup>1</sup>. It is not a reference to the unity of men in the Church. The interpretation, one body, that is, the Church, is due, indeed, not only to Ephesians and Colossians, but also to the talk of many members. The *πολλὰ μέλη* of vs.<sup>4</sup> would seem to be parallel to the many individuals (*πολλοί*) of vs.<sup>5</sup>. But Paul does not say, We, the many, are members of Christ's one body. The stress on *οἱ πολλοί* would then be unintelligible. He says, We are members of *one another*. There is an antithesis (given by *δέ*) which, as often elsewhere, is only imperfectly expressed: Though we, numerous as we are, are (only) one body in Christ, yet individually we are members of one another. I am the new man and you are the new man, but in the service of *one another* we are only members, limbs. Neither I nor you manifest the new man in his completeness. The meaning of *μέλη* which the context requires is, that we perform separate offices for one another. The parallel of *πολλὰ μέλη* is the various *πράξεις*, and these *πράξεις* are the various *χαρίσματα* next mentioned. That is the way Chrysostom read the passage: "And what if thou art not appointed to the same office, still the body is the same." Doubtless, however, as in 1 Cor. 12, Chrysostom meant body, *i.e.* church. There seems to be no occasion whatever to import into the passage the idea of a Christian society as a state or body politic, or social organism. There is no ground for thinking that the divinely appointed political state was an analogy by being an organic social body. His idea of the order of the state is, "Tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor" (13<sup>7</sup>).

The only necessary meaning then is, One divine nature (body) is given to us, but there are differences in its actuation of us. Paul does not add the individuals to sum up the body. All are the one body before the addition. He adds the special activities of individu-

als, to make the complete revelation of the one body. The point he is impressing is, that spite of diversities of function, there is but one spiritual nature in all, and there can therefore be no pretensions. In any case the figure is not that of Colossians and Ephesians, where Christ is the head of the body which is the Church. Here it must be that Christ is the spirit in all. We adhere to this by arguing that Christ's spiritual body is formed in every man.

*Application to 1 Cor. 12.*

Whether τῶν πνευματικῶν in vs.<sup>1</sup> is masculine or neuter is indifferent. The point is that all Christians despite the differences of their spiritual gifts are under the constraint of the Spirit. Howsoever they may as Gentiles have been led to their idols, it was a compulsion; they were 'carried away' captive. So, now, even in making the initial Christian profession, Jesus is the Lord, they are all actuated and constrained by the Spirit. The spirit is one and the same in all — but still there are diversities of charismata; the manifestations of the Spirit vary. Λόγος σοφίας, λόγος γνώσεως, special faith, healings, miracles, prophecies, discriminations of spirits, tongues, interpretations of tongues, all are various operations of one and the same Spirit (<sup>11</sup>). So far the passage is neutral. Only, there is no necessity of supposing that individuals have only portions of the Spirit, the whole Spirit being found in the collected company. The idea is, rather, that each man has *the* Spirit, and the special operations of it vary according to the will of the Spirit. He is about to say that many of these special demonstrations are transient and inferior to the permanent and constant attestation of the Spirit in every Christian, namely, the Christian life of love (13). For the present he halts to explain and justify the special and unequal displays of a more dramatic character. "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ" (<sup>12</sup>). The favorite interpretation of this is: so also Christ, the indwelling soul of the Church, is one. It is simpler to say: so also is Christ one body, thinking of his form of Holy Spirit as making the new self of every Christian. Therefore (<sup>13</sup>): "For also in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, and we all were saturated with one Spirit." This stress on *all* and *one* gives distinctness to the meaning that, though activities differ, we are all identical with one another, by the possession of the one Christ within us. After enumerating the various members of a body and their functions, he concludes again (<sup>20</sup>): πολλὰ μέλη, ἐν δὲ

σῶμα. He does not, however, think of the μέλη as ministering to the body; they minister to one another (23). Finally, therefore, ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους (27). Men are limbs of the body. In what sense? In the old sense that charismata vary. He begins, indeed, with 'apostles,' 'prophets,' 'teachers,' but he passes at once to *functions*: miracles, healings, etc. It is not the man but his function that is the μέλος. It is not the worker of the miracle who helps to constitute with other persons the one body of Christ. Simply, the one Christ has a special and peculiar activity in him. Prophecies, tongues, γνῶσις, all are destined to vanish (13<sup>8</sup>), and one best display of Christ shall be permanent in the life of love. The prophet will not cease to share in Christ when his prophesying ends. 'You are members' does not express the general fact of relation to Christ, but the unusual, unequal, extraordinary manifestations of Christ in us. To the same people he says, 'you are limbs,' and 'you are the body.' Chrysostom felt the meaning which we urge. He finds the phrase "all baptized into one body" (13) inexact. "And he said not, 'that we might all come to be of one body,' but 'that we might all *be* one body.' For he ever strives to use the most expressive phrase." Chrysostom thinks that for the sake of emphasis Paul has pushed the expression to an inexact extreme: "For thou art the body, even as I, and I even as thou." Chrysostom thinks it inexact, since for him body means Church. Again, for vs. 27, Chrysostom is helpful. "That is, 'not only,' saith he, 'are we a body but members also.'" Paul has, indeed, indulged in a paradox, but the paradox is made clearer by imitating Chrysostom's comment on 13: Thou art the body of Christ, and yet also a member. The debated ἐκ μέρους then clearly means what it means in 13<sup>9,12</sup>: 'partially,' *non ex integro sed ex parte* (Origen). Thou art the body, and yet in thy partial activity a member. This lends force to 17: If the *whole* body were an eye, where were the hearing?

I do not see that the view here presented has difficulties to encounter. The apparently Trinitarian formula of 2 Cor. 13<sup>14</sup> is surely only rhetorical amplification. The grace of Christ, the love of God, the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, all mean the same thing. It is not different from the three-fold enumeration of 1 Cor. 12<sup>4-6</sup>. Neither would the absence of Paul's imaginative conception from other early Christian documents be a difficulty. It would be difficult to show any uniformity among the earliest Christians in regard to the Holy Spirit. There was no 'doctrine.' Identification of Christ and the Spirit was common (Hermas, *Sim.* 9<sup>1</sup>). It is interesting to find in Tatian's Ad-

dress to the Greeks a mode of conception more or less apposite to this argued for Paul. Tatian avoids 'the pantheistic nuance' by distinguishing the cosmic spirit pervading matter from the more divine spirit, the redemptive spirit, the Logos. The Logos has the image and likeness of God, and in imitation of the Father who begat him made man an image of immortality. The fall led to the withdrawal of the union of the Logos with men. Man had now only the inferior kind of spirit which is called  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ , which if left alone dies with the flesh. Redemption is possible if the Logos, the image of God, becomes assimilated to the soul (<sup>4</sup>), enters into union with it (<sup>13</sup>), intimately combines with it, taking up its abode in it (<sup>15</sup>). Redemption is the reunion of the soul with the Holy Spirit (<sup>15</sup>). Tatian, however, believes in the restoration of fleshly substance to the soul at the resurrection (<sup>4</sup>).

Resisting the temptation to use hints of this conception found in Gnostic schools, we yet cannot refrain from asking if an explanation is not furnished for the strange vanishing of the distinct being of Christ in 1 Cor. 15<sup>28</sup>, when all by assimilation to him, by becoming Christ, are directly and perfectly the image of God, "that God may be all in all."