THE TYNDALE NEW TESTAMENT LECTURE, 1970*

2 CORINTHIANS 5:1–10: WATERSHED IN PAUL'S ESCHATOLOGY?

By M. J. HARRIS

In 1870 there appeared in France from the pen of a Protestant theologian who was a disciple of Schleiermacher and Ritschl, a volume entitled *L'Apôtre Paul. Esquisse d'une histoire de sa pensée.*[1] Louis Auguste Sabatier's aim was, in his own words, 'to write not a general biography of Paul, but a biography of his mind and the history of his thought'[2] which would refute the denial, both by the orthodox and by the Tübingen rationalists, of progression in Pauline theology.[3] As the first thoroughgoing proponent of the 'progressive character of Paulinism', as he termed it,[4] Sabatier ignited a flame which has been burning steadily ever since, despite repeated attempts to extinguish it or reduce its size.

Numerous *a priori* objections, for example, have been levelled against the hypothesis that development is traceable in Pauline theology: precisely what constitutes development or progression of thought is disputed, it is alleged; the extent of the *corpus Paulinum* is contested; the chronological sequence of Paul's Epistles is uncertain; any criteria used for grouping Paul's letters for the purposes of comparison must necessarily be arbitrary; the Pauline correspondence is largely occasional; the argument from silence, which is not infrequently appealed to in support of developmental theories, is notoriously insecure; Paul's extant letters all fall within a limited period of his life—roughly speaking, the second half of his career as a Christian missionary, when he might fairly be supposed to have reached Christian maturity; the essentially paradoxical character of

* Delivered at Tyndale House, Cambridge, July 1970.

[1] Strasbourg, 1870.

[2] *Paul,*[4] ET by A. M. Hellier, ed. G. G. Findlay, Hodder and Stoughton, London (1899) 2.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. ix–xiii.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

Christian verities gives pause to the effort to classify parts or the whole of Paul's theology according to successive stages of development. The validity of such arguments is not to be denied, but rather than rendering the quest to retrace any part of the apostle's spiritual and intellectual pilgrimage nugatory, these *a priori* objections simply form easily discernible sign-posts which remind travellers of the hazards of the way.

The present paper does not aim to offer a systematic exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5:1–10, but rather will highlight three issues arising from the passage which impinge directly on the notion of development in Paul's eschatological thought. They are:

1. Paul's personal relationship to the Parousia of Christ;
2. the time of the receipt of the spiritual body; and
3. the location and state of deceased Christians.

The evidence of 2 Corinthians 5 on these three points will be examined and compared with that of earlier and later Pauline Epistles in an attempt to determine the nature and the permanency of any altered perspective which might be apparent in this chapter. For the purposes of this discussion, it is assumed that 1 Corinthians 15 was penned after 1 Thessalonians 4 and before 2 Corinthians 5[5] and that the date of Philippians is subsequent to the second Corinthian Epistle.[6] The evidence of the Pastorals has not been included.

I. PAUL'S PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP TO THE PAROUSIA OF CHRIST

Not without reason has it been observed that throughout 2 Corinthians can be heard 'the rustling of the wings of the angel of death'.[7] Nowhere is this rustling more strident than in the passage 4:7–5:10 which deals with the sufferings and

[5] No scholar known to the present writer (except W. Schmithals, *Paulus und die Gnostiker*, Herbert Reich, Hamburg (1965) 179f., 184) accepts the authenticity of these three Epistles but rejects the sequence 1 Thessalonians 4–1 Corinthians 15–2 Corinthians 5.

[6] Particularly when the Roman provenance and therefore late dating of Philippians are assumed, the implications of an Ephesian dating immediately before or after 1 Corinthians must not be ignored. See nn. 23, 62 below, and also P. Hoffmann, *Die Toten in Christus*,[2] Aschendorff, Münster (1969) 323–329.

[7] H. Weinel, *St. Paul. The Man and his Work*, ET by G. A. Bienemann, ed. W. D. Morrison, Williams and Norgate, London (1906) 379. Of 2 Corinthians, E. B. Allo writes (*Saint Paul. Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens*,[2] Paris (1956) 18): 'Cette épître, si originale sous tant d'aspects, prend en plusieurs passages un ton, un coloris très spécial, du fait que Paul y paraît bien plus préoccupé qu'ailleurs de son état physique précaire, et de l'idée de la mort.'

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

rewards of the apostolic office. Yet although Paul felt himself encompassed by affliction, perplexity and persecution (2 Cor. 4:8f.) which were sapping his physical strength, he was simultaneously conscious of the operation of divine life in and through him. *ζωή* was apparent in his bodily existence at the same time as *νέκρωσις* (2 Cor. 4:10f.), *ἀνακαίνωσις* at the same time as *διαφθορά* (2 Cor. 4:16). Concurrent with the steady, irreversible process of physical debilitation was a process of spiritual renewal. 2 Corinthians 5:1–10 is primarily concerned with the outcome of these two processes, viz. the dismantling of the earthly tent-house (2 Cor. 5:1) and the swallowing up of mortal existence by immortal life (2 Cor. 5:4). That is, *κατάλυσις* (2 Cor. 5:1) is to *διαφθορά* (2 Cor. 4:16a) what *κατάποσις* (2 Cor. 5:4) is to *ἀνακαίνωσις* (2 Cor. 4:16b).[8]

'For we know', Paul writes in 2 Corinthians 5:1, 'that whenever our earthly tent-dwelling be destroyed, we become possessors of a building provided by God, a permanent heavenly house not built by human hands.' That *ἐὰν . . . καταλυθῇ* is not equivalent to *εἰ καὶ . . . κατελύθη, ἀλλά. . .*[9] or *κἂν . . . καταλυθῇ* hardly needs to be demonstrated, since a concessive use of *ἐάν* (without other particles) seems to be lacking in Paul and in the New Testament in general, while far from there being any indication in the context that Paul is merely envisaging his death as a remote and almost hypothetical possibility, 2 Corinthians 4:10–12, 14, 16 points to the apostle's awareness that at any time in the near future the *ἐνέργεια τοῦ θανάτου* (2 Cor. 4:12) could reach its climax in his actual death. Furthermore, *ἐάν* in this protasis in 2 Corinthians 5:1 can be regarded simply as a conditional particle only if an expression such as *πρὸ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου* be added: 'if I die'[10] could not stand unqualified, since Paul believed in the universality of death (Rom. 5:12; 1 Cor. 15:22).

[8] While the outcome of the *διαφθορά* is clearly the *κατάλυσις* of 2 Corinthians 5:1, the *ἡ οἰκοδομὴ ἐκ θεοῦ* of this verse does not mark the result of a process of *οἰκοδόμησις*, as though *ἀνακαίνωσις* in 2 Corinthians 4:16 referred to a building process. The *οἰκοδομή* is related to 2 Corinthians 4:16 only through *ἐὰν . . . καταλυθῇ*: not until the *κατάλυσις* terminated the *διαφθορά* could the building from God be acquired. It is the *κατάποσις* of 2 Corinthians 5:4, not the *οἰκοδομή* of 2 Corinthians 5:1, which alludes to the climax of the process of inward renewal. As such, *κατάποσις* implies the acceleration of the process of 'Christification'—that is, an act of transformation.

[9] *Cf.* 2 Corinthians 4:16, *εἰ καὶ . . . ἀλλ' . . . .*

[10] It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the *καταλυθῆναι* of 2 Corinthians

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

In light of the improbability that *ἐάν* is concessive and the necessity of qualifying the protasis if *ἐάν* bears its regular conditional sense, a third proposal merits consideration. Examples are to be found in the LXX,[11] in the Pauline Epistles,[12] and in the remainder of the New Testament,[13] where *ἐάν* followed by the aorist subjunctive approximates to *ὅταν* in meaning. In such cases the conditionality of the protasis is not necessarily compromised by the notion of temporality. Thus in 2 Corinthians 5:1 it was when, but only when, the tent which formed his earthly house had been dismantled that Paul was to become a possessor of the *οἰκοδομὴ ἐκ θεοῦ*. He did not write *ὅταν . . . καταλυθῇ* because only the actual arrival of death would frustrate his natural desire to be alive to witness the Parousia. Yet it would appear that, at the time of the composition of 2 Corinthians (or at least of 2 Cor. 1–9), his pre-Parousia decease seemed to him more probable than his survival until the Advent. In particular, 2 Corinthians 4:14 apparently presupposes that his *περιφέρειν* of the *νέκρωσις* of Jesus (2 Cor. 4:10) and the *ἐνέργεια τοῦ θανάτου* within him (2 Cor. 4:12) would ultimately issue in his death, but just as the preservation of his life amid apostolic tribulation witnessed to the resurrection power of Jesus (2 Cor. 4:8–11; *cf.* Phil. 3:10), so his preservation in death through a resurrection like Christ's (*σὺν Ἰησοῦ*, 2 Cor. 4:14) would testify to God's transcendent power (2 Cor. 4:7, 14).[14] Although the distinction between *ἡμεῖς* and *ὑμεῖς* in 2 Corinthians 4:12, 14 (*cf.* 1:14) need not imply that Paul expected that the Corinthians, unlike himself,

5:1 refers to death. For L. Brun, *ZNW* 28 (1929) 219f., however, *καταλυθῆναι* denotes the *Vollmass* and *Gesamtresultat* of the process of destruction, of past and future apostolic sufferings and afflictions, without signifying or including death in the literal sense, while W. Mundle, writing in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher*, J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen (1927) 95f., sees in the term a general reference to the destruction and termination of earthly corporeal existence and therefore an allusion to a twofold possibility—Paul's transformation at the Parousia or his death before the Parousia.

[11] Isaiah 24:13; Amos 7:2; Tobit 4:3 (BA); 6:17 (BA) (S reads *ὅταν*)—cited by *Arndt*, 210.

[12] 1 Corinthians 16:10; 2 Corinthians 9:4; 13:2 (all combinations of *ἐάν* and *ἔρχομαι*).

[13] Matthew 9:21; John 6:62 (?); 12:32; 14:3; 16:7 (?); Hebrews 3:7f. (=3:15; 4:7 and Ps. 94:7f. LXX); 1 John 2:28 (ℵ A B C P) (K L read *ὅταν*); 3:2; 3 John 10.

[14] 2 Corinthians 4:14, like the qualifying *εἰς ὃν ἠλπίκαμεν καὶ ἔτι ῥύσεται* which follows the over-confident *καὶ ῥύσεται* in 2 Corinthians 1:10, indicates Paul's awareness that divine deliverance from death (*cf.* 2 Cor. 1:9f.; 4:8–11; 6:9) was not guaranteed even to an apostle.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

would be spared death before the Parousia, it certainly suggests that he was reckoning himself among those destined to be raised as well as transformed.

There is compelling evidence, on the other hand, that before the time of 2 Corinthians, Paul reckoned on the probability of his own survival until the Advent. In 1 Thessalonians 4, in the course of his reply to the Thessalonian Christians who were grieving over the pre-Advent death of some fellow-believers because they feared that they had thereby forfeited the right to share in the Parousial glory of Christ, Paul twice uses the expression *ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι (εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου)* (1 Thes. 4:15, 17). It cannot be claimed that, because neither writer(s) nor addressees had already died, *ἡμεῖς* was an inevitable designation, for subsequently Paul classed himself with the dead (see 1 Cor. 6:14; 2 Cor. 4:14; Phil. 3:11). Nor need the use of *ἡμεῖς* imply that Paul believed in a fixity within the two designated groups (*i.e.*, *οἱ ζῶντες—οἱ νεκροί*) since presumably he was not merely comforting the Thessalonians concerning the past but also reassuring them for the future: they were to cease mourning (*ἵνα μὴ λυπῆσθε*, 1 Thes. 4:13) for those of their number who had died and never recommence mourning should others die (*cf. οἱ κοιμώμενοι*, 1 Thes. 4:13; and 1 Thes. 5:10). Yet 1 Thessalonians 4:15 provides more than a general and impersonal statement of the two categories of Christians at the Advent.[15] *οἱ ζῶντες* are identified, not merely as 'those alive at the coming of the Lord' (as if Paul had written simply *οἱ ζῶντες ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου*), but as 'we who shall continue living until (*εἰς*[16]) the Lord's Advent'. The asyndetic *οἱ περιλειπόμενοι* is epexegetic, further describing the *ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες*: 'we who are now[17]

[15] *Pace* A. L. Moore, *The Parousia in the New Testament*, E. J. Brill, Leiden (1966) 110.

[16] *εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν (τοῦ κυρίου)*, which should be construed with *οἱ περιλειπόμενοι* and not (as A. Wimmer, *Bib* 36 (1955) 275f., 285) with *οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν*, is not simply the equivalent of *ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ* (*cf.* 1 Thes. 2:19; 3:13; 5:23; 1 Cor. 15:23) but specifies the temporal limit (*εἰς*) of the *περιλείπεσθαι*. 'Paul is not prone to confuse *εἰς* and *ἐν*' (N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol. III. *Syntax*, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh (1963) 256).

[17] While F. Prat (*The Theology of Saint Paul*. I, ET by J. L. Stoddard, Burns Oates & Co., London (1933) 76 n.1) claims that *ἁρπαγησόμεθα* in 1 Thessalonians 4:17 gives to both *ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες* (*nos viventes*) and (*ἡμεῖς*) *οἱ περιλειπόμενοι* (*nos superstites*) its future connotation, B. Rigaux (*Saint Paul. Les Épîtres aux Thessaloniciens*, J. Gabalda & Co., Paris (1956) 540) comments 'nous admettons volontiers que les présents doivent être entendus comme tels et non pas "ceux qui seront vivants à la parousie" '.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

alive, [viz. those] who are destined to survive until the Parousia'.

The interpretation of 1 Corinthians 15:51 bristles with problems. The original text, it seems, read *ἰδοὺ μυστήριον ὑμῖν λέγω. πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα.* But does the enigmatic phrase *πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα*, which, to judge by the textual variants, caused considerable difficulty to the scribes, signify universal survival until the Parousia, universal escape from death at the Parousia, majority survival until the Parousia, minority survival until the Parousia, or the survival of at least some Christians until the Parousia? If, as the majority of grammarians believe,[18] *πάντες οὐ* is equivalent to *οὐ πάντες*, the first two views are excluded. Again, on the last interpretation ('[Christians such as] we shall not all fall asleep') it is difficult adequately to explain why Paul did not write *πάντες οὐ κοιμηθήσονται* or simply *οἱ ζῶντες ἀλλαγήσονται*. The viable alternatives, then, are: (1) '*not* all of us [presently alive] shall fall asleep', *i.e.*, while some of us may die, most of us will not; (2) 'we shall not, *all* of us [presently alive], fall asleep', *i.e.*, while most of us will die, some of us will not. Two observations favour the latter view (minority survival until the Parousia): in a negative sentence, *πάντες* may stand for *τινές*[19]; in writing *πάντες οὐ*, and not, as logic might have demanded, *οὐ πάντες*, Paul probably intended the emphasis to be placed on *πάντες* (note the *πάντες . . . πάντες* parallelism), rather than on the negative.

For the exegesis of the concluding clause of 1 Corinthians 15:51 (*πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα*), the most secure point of orientation is undoubtedly the parallel expression *ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα* in verse 52, where *ἡμεῖς* and *οἱ νεκροί* are clearly contrasted. Thus the 'we shall be changed' of verse 52 would indicate that the 'we shall all be changed' of verse 51 refers to the universal transformation of Christians alive at the Parousia, rather than to the transformation of all Christians, survivors and deceased, at the Parousia. On this showing, the essence of the *μυστήριον* was not that a transformation of both the living and the dead was to occur immediately at the Parousia,[20] but rather that

[18] See, *e.g.*, *BDF*, 224 para. 433 (2); N. Turner, *Syntax*, 287.

[19] See the discussion of T. C. Edwards, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Hodder and Stoughton, London (1885) 452f.

[20] So J. Jeremias, *NTS* 2 (1955–1956) 159.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

those Christians who did not, by a pre-Parousia death, qualify for the transformation which was the prerequisite for the inheritance of the kingdom (1 Cor. 15:36, 50), nevertheless would all, without exception, undergo the required transformation at the Parousia.

'While we who are now alive shall not *all* fall asleep, *all* of us who survive until the Parousia will be changed.' *πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα* shows that Paul now regarded survival until the Parousia—and not, as in 1 Thessalonians 4, death before the Parousia—as an exceptional experience among Christians in general,[21] while *πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα*, when compared with *ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα* in verse 52, indicates that he yet could still classify himself with those who would remain alive until the Advent.

But even when Paul could reckon on his survival until the Parousia, along with a majority (as in 1 Thes. 4:15, 17) or a minority (as in 1 Cor. 15:51f.) of Christians, he did not discount the possibility of his being 'poured out as a libation'. In 1 Thessalonians 5:10 he speaks of the Lord Jesus Christ 'who died for us so that whether we wake or sleep we might live with him' (RSV). In spite of the potent arguments that may be adduced in favour of the view that *γρηγορεῖν* and *καθεύδειν* here allude, possibly in a proverbial expression, to being awake and being asleep (in a physical sense), the context of 1 Thessalonians 4:13–5:11 supports the traditional exegesis in which *γρηγορεῖν* and *καθεύδειν* specify, in the manner of *οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι* and *οἱ κοιμηθέντες* (=*οἱ νεκροί*) in 1 Thessalonians 4:13–17, the two categories of believers at the Parousia.[22] But here, be it noted, Paul is simply stating alternative possibilities (*εἴτε γρηγορῶμεν εἴτε καθεύδωμεν*), not expressing his personal expectancy (as in 1 Thes. 4 and 1 Cor. 15) or reckoning with the implications of a distinct probability (as in 2 Cor. 5). Again, with its assertion 'God raised the Lord and will raise us up in turn by his power', 1 Corinthians 6:14 is equally clear evidence that Paul always perceived that a pre-Parousia death was not impossible for himself or any Christian. In this

[21] Thus also C. H. Dodd, *New Testament Studies*, Manchester University Press, Manchester (1953) 110; C. K. Barrett, *SJT* 6 (1953) 143.

[22] Thus, *e.g.*, F. Guntermann, *Die Eschatologie des Hl. Paulus*, Münster (1932) 50, 283, 290.

matter of Paul's 'life expectancy' it is appropriate only to speak of possibilities or probabilities, never of certainties.

2 Corinthians 5, therefore, marks a decisive turning-point in the apostle's estimate of his own relation to the Parousia. No longer is his pre-Advent decease a possibility more hypothetical than real. For the first time—to judge by the extant Pauline Epistles—he has begun to reckon with the implications of that possibility, a possibility which has ceased to be a distant reality by becoming a probability.[23]

2. THE TIME OF THE RECEIPT OF THE SPIRITUAL BODY

Attention may now be given to the second question raised by any exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5:1–10—the time of the receipt of the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*.

By some scholars the *οἰκοδομὴ ἐκ θεοῦ* of 2 Corinthians 5:1 has been identified with the Church as the Body of Christ or as the New Temple:[24] by others it is equated with heaven itself, with celestial beatitude, with the heavenly Temple, with a celestial dwelling-place (*cf.* Jn. 14:2), with a vestment of celestial glory, or with the heavenly mode of existence. The principal objection to all such identifications lies in the fact that, in view of 2 Corinthians 4:16a, it seems incontestable that the *ἐπίγειος οἰκία* of 2 Corinthians 5:1a alludes primarily, if not solely, to the physical body and that therefore it would destroy the parallelism and opposition of the two parts of 2 Corinthians 5:1 if the second, antithetical *οἰκία* were referred to anything other than some form of embodiment.[25] Moreover, the correspondence between Paul's delineation of the 'building' in 2 Corinthians 5:1 and his description of the spiritual body in 1 Corinthians 15 also points unmistakably to the identification of the *οἰκοδομή* with the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*. Both are of divine origin (*ἐκ θεοῦ*; *cf.* 1 Cor. 15:38), spiritual (*ἀχειροποίητον*; *cf.* 1 Cor. 15:44, 46), permanent and indestructible (*αἰώνιον*; *cf.* 1 Cor. 15:42, 52–54), and heavenly (*ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*; *cf.* 1

[23] If, however, Philippians is dated before 2 Corinthians, the significance of 2 Corinthians 5 would be eclipsed since Philippians 1:19–26; 3:11 shows Paul seriously reckoning with the possibility of a pre-Advent decease.

[24] See, *e.g.*, E. E. Ellis, *Paul and His Recent Interpreters*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids (1961) 41f.

[25] This argument assumes that *οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον κτλ.* is in apposition to *οἰκοδομήν*.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

Cor. 15:40, 48f.). 2 Corinthians 5:1–10 may legitimately, therefore, be treated as dealing with the believer's receipt of the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*.

But when did Paul expect to receive a body of glory comparable to Christ's? There can be little doubt that in 1 Corinthians 15, as in 1 Thessalonians 4, he envisaged believers as being transformed at the Parousia. It was at the coming of the Lord that the dead in Christ would rise and perhaps then witness the transformation of the living (1 Thes. 4:15f.); it was at his coming that all those who belonged to Christ would be made alive (1 Cor. 15:22f.). Attempts to find in 1 Corinthians 15 inchoate adumbrations of the view that the loss of the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* was to be immediately followed by the reception of the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* are less than convincing. First, Paul's use of the analogy of the seed cannot be taken to prove or even to suggest an immediate continuity between successive forms of embodiment.[26] Secondly, in the statement 'the dead will be raised imperishable' in 1 Corinthians 15:52, the becoming *ἄφθαρτος* need not have preceded the *ἔγερσις* which occurs at the Parousia. Paul probably regarded the two events as concurrent,[27] not separated by the interval between the Christian's death and Christ's Parousia. In the third place, that 1 Corinthians 15:35 reads 'With what kind of body do they come (*ἔρχονται*)?' and not 'What kind of body do they receive [at the Parousia]?' can scarcely be deemed significant.[28] Since this verse embodies Paul's version of his objector's questions (be the objector imaginary or real) and not his own queries (which might reflect his own thought), it is inadmissible to supply a phrase such as 'with Christ at his coming' with the verb *ἔρχονται* and assume that Paul implies that the receipt of the spiritual body antedated the believer's emergence from the grave or coming with Christ.

What is the testimony of 2 Corinthians 5 on this point? The apodosis of the conditional clause in verse 1 reads *οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ ἔχομεν*. Does *ἔχομεν* here signify present posses-

[26] See, however, R. H. Charles, *Eschatology. The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity*,[2] Schocken Books, New York (1963=1913) 450, 453, 459.

[27] *Cf.* E. Teichmann, *Die paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht und ihre Beziehung zur jüdischen Apokalyptik*, Freiburg i.B. (1896) 51; G. Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids (1961=1930) 213.

[28] But *cf.* R. F. Hettlinger, *SJT* 10 (1957) 188.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

sion or future acquisition? Any interpretation which sees the ἔχειν as a present possession has the effect of converting a conditional sentence into a concessive sentence: 'If and when I die, I acquire a spiritual body' becomes 'Even if I die, I nevertheless still possess an οἰκοδομὴ ἐκ θεοῦ'. As it is, the apodosis would become true if and only if, or when and only when, the protasis was fulfilled. Not before or until the κατάλυσις of the ἐπίγειος οἰκία had occurred could the receipt of the ἀχειροποίητος οἰκία take place. Just as the καταλυθῆναι specifies the future act of dying, so the ἔχειν refers to (or at least implies) a future act of acquisition. Furthermore, unless the 'building from God' be distinguished from the 'habitation from heaven' of verse 2,[29] the possession of this building is a future experience, an object of earnest hope (ἐπενδύσασθαι ἐπιποθοῦντες, verse 2), not a present reality.[30]

If, then, the ἔχομεν of 2 Corinthians 5:1 alludes to a future acquisition of the spiritual body, does this occur at the Parousia or at death? Not a few commentators interpret the verb as a futuristic present:[31] what is, in fact, to be obtained only at the Advent has become, to faith, an assured possession of the present, this sure conviction arising from the apostle's knowledge of the character of a God whose word was his deed and from the pledge of the resurrection-transformation God had already given in the Spirit (2 Cor. 5:5). But, apart from the fact that the futuristic present is usually found with verbs of motion, what consolation would be offered Paul in the event of his *death* (ἐὰν . . . καταλυθῇ) by the knowledge that at the *Parousia* he would receive a spiritual body? The moment when the consolation is needed must be the moment when the consolation is given; and the consolation received at death cannot simply be identical with that assurance of the future acquisition of the resurrection body which is already possessed during life. Since the receipt of the σῶμα πνευματικόν *at the Parousia* was, on this view, guaranteed whether or not death had oc-

[29] As is done by M. E. Thrall, *The First and Second Letters of Paul to the Corinthians*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1965) 146f.

[30] οἰκοδομὴν . . . ἔχομεν cannot, accordingly, be reckoned parallel to ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα (Heb. 8:1) or ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον (Heb. 13:10).

[31] See, *e.g.*, K. Deissner, *Auferstehungshoffnung und Pneumagedanke bei Paulus*, Leipzig (1912) 57; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*,[4] Nashville (1934) 881f., 1019.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

curred previously, any notion of conditionality in 2 Corinthians 5:1 is virtually obliterated.

It remains to propose that ἔχομεν dates the possession of the spiritual body from the moment of the destruction of the earthly tent-dwelling, *i.e.*, from the moment of death.[32] On this view, the present tense ἔχομεν might stand in the apodosis for two reasons. First, after ἐὰν . . . καταλυθῇ which points to a single, specific occurrence in the future, a punctiliar future might have been expected in an apodosis whose realization was dependent on the prior or simultaneous fulfilment of the condition. And the successive aorists in verses 2, 3, 4 (ἐπενδύσασθαι [*bis*], ἐνδυσάμενοι, καταποθῇ) which are used to denote the future reception of the spiritual body would point in the same direction. But in Hellenistic Greek, the punctiliar future of ἔχειν (σχήσω, 'I shall acquire') is scarcely ever found.[33] And, at least in Pauline usage, ἕξω never expresses (although it always presupposes) punctiliar action.[34] Consequently ἔχομεν may stand for σχήσομεν in specifying a future acquisition.[35] And, it might be observed, the certainty of this future acquisition is expressed solely by οἴδαμεν—not by the tense of ἔχομεν. Secondly, alongside this linguistic and negative explanation of Paul's use of ἔχομεν should be set a theological and positive motive, the principal reason for the usage. He may have wished to indicate that between the destruction of the ἐπίγειος οἰκία and the receipt of the οἰκοδομὴ ἐκ θεοῦ there was no interval

[32] So also, *inter alios*, G. B. Winer, *A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, ET by J. H. Thayer, Andover (1872) 266 ('The future ἕξομεν would have been inexact; the instantaneous entrance into a new habitation, the moment the καταλύεσθαι takes place, is intended to be expressed'); C. F. G. Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther*,[8] Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen (1900) 172 (ἔχομεν 'bestimmt den Zeitpunkt des Besitzantritts: mit dem Eintritt des καταλύεσθαι hat der Gestorbene statt des zerstörten Leibes den von Gott herrührenden Leib'); R. H. Charles, *Eschatology*, 458f. ('*When* we die—observe the determination of the point of time—we have [ἔχομεν], we come into possession of, an immortal body in heaven'); H. Hanse, 'ἔχω', *TWNT* II 825 ('Those who bear the spirit [verse 5] are at once invested with the heavenly body at death, and do not have to sleep until the resurrection').

[33] *Cf. MM* 270; E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, II. 1, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin (1926) 212.

[34] In eight of the twelve uses (excluding Mk. 16:18 and including Rev. 2:10 [א 046 vg syr]) of ἕξω in the New Testament, including the three Pauline occurrences, its linear significance is clear (Mt. 12:11; Lk. 11:5; Jn. 8:12; Rom. 13:3; 1 Cor. 7:28; Gal. 6:4; 2 Tim. 2:17; Rev. 2:10), while in Matthew 1:23 and possibly Mark 10:21 (=Mt. 19:21; Lk. 18:22) ἕξω denotes punctiliar action.

[35] That ἔχειν might be used in a punctiliar sense is apparent from Romans 6:22 and 1 Corinthians 9:17.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

of homelessness. The moment one residence was destroyed, another was received.[36] *ἔχομεν* would then point to an immediate succession between two forms of embodiment without implying a long-standing or even momentary coexistence of two bodies. 'As soon as our earthly tent-dwelling is taken down, we are the recipients of a building from God.'

Nor is *ἔχομεν* the only indication in 2 Corinthians 5 that death is regarded as the moment of acquisition of the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*. Any exegesis of this passage must postulate a reason for Paul's use of the doubly compounded verb *ἐπενδύειν*, since in 1 Corinthians 15, in a similar context, the form *ἐνδύειν* is employed.[37] It has become almost traditional to posit an essential distinction between these two verbs: the one (*ἐνδύειν*), it is claimed, is used of the resurrection of the dead, the other (*ἐπενδύειν*) Paul reserves as a distinctive term denoting the special experience of Christians who survive until the Advent. Those who have been temporarily stripped of their corporeality by death, at the resurrection are *reclothed* by the spiritual body, while those who survive to witness the Parousia are *overclothed* by the resurrection body: as T. S. Evans has aptly expressed it, 'the naked indue, the not-naked superindue'.[38] On purely linguistic grounds, however, the validity of the alleged distinction, as it applies to 2 Corinthians 5, must be seriously questioned. J. H. Moulton cites *ἐνδυσάμενοι* in 2 Corinthians 5:3 as an example of 'the survival in NT Greek of a classical idiom by which the preposition in a compound is omitted, without weakening the sense, when the verb is repeated'.[39] In such cases, claims Moulton, the simplex may be treated as fully equivalent to the compound, although he adds 'but of course in any given case it may be otherwise explicable'.[40] What is more, the fourfold use of *ἐνδύειν* in 1 Corinthians 15:53f. with reference to the transformation (*cf.* *ἀλλαγησόμεθα*, 1 Cor. 15:51f.) which must be experienced by any corruptible,

[36] That, in its relation to the verb of the apodosis, the aorist (subjunctive) after *ἐάν* or *ὅταν* in the protasis is future perfect in sense (N. Turner, *Syntax*, 114), does not militate against this proposal.

[37] 'Tout le raisonnement invite à donner son entière valeur au préfixe *ἐπί*' (J. Dupont, *ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩΙ. L'union avec le Christ suivant saint Paul*, Desclée de Brouwer, Paris (1952) 136.

[38] *Exp* 2nd series 3 (1882) 174.

[39] *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. I. *Prolegomena*,[3] T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh (1908) 115.

[40] *Ibid.*

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

mortal man (*τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο, τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο*) before he can inherit incorruptibility and immortality shows that the verb is not a term used exclusively to describe the resurrection of the dead.

Why, then, if it was not to mark a difference between the transformation of the living and the resurrection of the dead, did Paul use *ἐπενδύειν* in 2 Corinthians 5:2, 4? It seems doubtful whether the motive was merely to create alliteration, since *ἐπενδύσασθαι* precedes *ἐπιποθοῦντες*, although alliteration abounds in 2 Corinthians. Nor is there basis for treating the *ἐπ-* as intensive ('to put on in increasing measure' or 'to be completely clothed') as though there were stages of incorporation into the Body of Christ[41] or degrees of investiture with the spiritual body. Positively, it may be contended that Paul chose *ἐπενδύειν* in preference to *ἐνδύειν* in order to indicate that the continuity between the successive forms of corporeality—the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* and the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*—was such that the *ἔνδυσις* presupposed no *ἔκδυσις*[42] and was therefore more accurately an *ἐπένδυσις*,[43] the physical body (not the 'inner man'[44]) being the *χιτών* over which the *ἐπενδύτης* of the resurrection body was cast,[45] or, to preserve Paul's mixed metaphor, the earthly tent-dwelling forming the *ὑποδύτης* and the heavenly habitation the *ἐπενδύτης*. Paul viewed himself as donning the resurrection body without having first doffed the earthly body—it was to be a case of addition without prior subtraction,[46] a case not of investiture succeeding divestiture but of 'superinvestiture' without any divestiture. That the earthly house is said to be destroyed (verse 1) does not militate against this conclusion, since unlike verse 1, verse 2 is developing the 'transformation'—not the 'exchange'—motif in relating the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* to the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*. Thus by his use of *ἐπενδύειν* in 2 Corinthians 5:2, 4 Paul may be reinforcing the effect of

[41] As R. F. Hettlinger, *SJT* 10 (1957) 189, 190 n. 5, 192, 193 n. 4, maintains.

[42] So also H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*,[9] Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen (1924) 161.

[43] Although this noun is not attested, it may be conveniently used as the substantival equivalent of *ἐπενδύσασθαι* (2 Cor. 5:2, 4).

[44] As G. Wagner, *RHPR* 41 (1961) 389, believes.

[45] 'Superinvestiture' (*ἐπενδύσασθαι*) is therefore not a privilege reserved for Christians alive at the Parousia but the experience of every Christian either at death or at the Parousia. The *ἐπ-* in *ἐπενδύσασθαι* signifies neither intensity nor direction nor exactly supplementation but rather addition by 'superinduement'.

[46] For a contrary view, see C. F. D. Moule, *NTS* 12 (1965–6) 107, 116, 123.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

ἔχομεν by emphasizing that the moment of death is also the moment of investiture, that the κατάλυσις and the ἐπένδυσις are virtually coincident.[47]

However the ostensible discrepancy between 1 Corinthians 15 and 2 Corinthians 5 with regard to Paul's view of the time of the Christian's receipt of his spiritual body be explained,[48] this difference between the two passages should not be ignored. It furnishes a second reason for regarding 2 Corinthians 5 as a significant milestone in the progression of the apostle's eschatological thought.

3. THE LOCATION AND STATE OF DECEASED CHRISTIANS

The third and final area of study concerns the location and state of the Christian dead. It is here that 2 Corinthians 5:8 is relevant. Against the exegetes who refer verses 6–10 of 2 Corinthians 5 to the Parousia,[49] it must be asserted that a temporal distinction can hardly be drawn between the destruction of the earthly house (verse 1) and departure from the mortal body (verse 8), referring the former to the time of death but the latter to the Advent. The ἐκδημία of verse 8, like the κατάλυσις of verse 1, transpires at death. Moreover, there is no reason to suppose that an interval of time separates the ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος from the ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον. As in Philippians 1:23, the καί joining the two infinitives is explicative: to have departed from this life is to have taken up residence in the presence of the Lord—the second occurrence, like the first, transpires *articulo mortis*. This conclusion is confirmed by the two previous verses. The implication of verse 6 is that the state of ἐνδημεῖν ἐν τῷ σώματι and the state of ἐκδημεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου are coincident: as soon as residence in physical embodiment ceases, so also does absence from the Lord. Again, verse 7 envisages walking διὰ πίστεως and seeing

[47] Another reason for Paul's use of ἐπενδύειν could conceivably have been to assert, against certain Corinthian 'proto-Gnostics' (*cf.* 1 Cor. 15:12) who might have maliciously understood the ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν of 1 Corinthians 15:53f. to imply that disembodied immortality formed the content of the Christian hope, that the house from heaven was put on *over*, and therefore replaced, the earthly house: it was not a case of simply assuming (ἐνδύειν) (a disembodied) immortality

[48] See, *e.g.*, W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*,[2] SPCK, London (1955) 314–320.

[49] See, in particular, P. Hoffmann, *Toten*, 281, 284f., 321.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον as two mutually exclusive and immediately successive states of Christian existence. If death terminates the believer's life of faith, it also inaugurates his face-to-face vision of Christ.

ἐνδημεῖν πρὸς τὸν κύριον, accordingly, depicts the location and state of the Christian immediately after his death. The phrase clearly implies 'spatial' proximity to Christ, and since Paul believed that Christ, after his resurrection, ascended to heaven and the right hand of God,[50] the 'dead in Christ' must be 'located' in heaven prior to the Advent of Christ. But what of their state? What is the significance of *ἐνδημεῖν πρός*?

Once it is recognized that the ingressive aorist *ἐνδημῆσαι* ('take up residence') has no implication of movement or direction, the temptation of claiming[51] that *πρός* denotes both linear motion and punctiliar rest on arrival loses its attractiveness—a claim which, in any case, fails to recognize that in Hellenistic Greek the distinction between motion and rest has become obscured so that *πρός* with the accusative, when used to indicate a relationship between persons, may mean simply 'with', 'in the presence of'.[52]

πρὸς τὸν κύριον may merely be the equivalent of *ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ κυρίου*, or better, *παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ*. Moreover, when denoting a relationship between living persons (*πρός τινα εἶναι* [=*εἶναι σύν τινι*]), the preposition *πρός* itself contains no idea of reciprocity of action. But with this said, it seems inadequate to conclude that the believer's dwelling with the Lord implies no more than his incorporation in Christ,[53] or his impassive 'spatial' juxtaposition to Christ, or a state of semi-conscious subsistence or suspended animation. When Paul describes the future state of the believer as one of dwelling (*ἐνδημεῖν*) in the company of (*πρός*) the Lord, he must be referring to some heightened form of inter-personal communion, particularly since the Christian's eternal destiny[54] would scarcely be de-

[50] 2 Thessalonians 1:7; Romans 8:34; Colossians 3:1; Ephesians 1:20; 2:6.

[51] See, *e.g.*, P. E. Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London (1961) 178 n. 53.

[52] *Cf. BDF*, 124 para. 239 (1); P. F. Regard, *Contribution à l'étude des prépositions dans la langue du Nouveau Testament*, Ernest Leroux, Paris (1919) 552, 556, 579.

[53] See E. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*, Thomas Nelson, London (1966) 269.

[54] But J. N. Sevenster ('Some Remarks on the *ΓΥΜΝΟΣ* in 2 Cor. 5:3', in *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan*, Bohn, Haarlem (1953) 207) distinguishes

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

picted as qualitatively inferior to his experience of fellowship with Christ upon earth while walking *διὰ πίστεως*. Just as *οἰκεῖν ἐν* (used of the Spirit in the believer) 'denotes a settled permanent penetrative influence',[55] so *ἐνδημεῖν πρός* (used of the believer with the Lord) suggests a settled permanent mutual fellowship.

But had Paul always believed that at his death the Christian departed to Christ's immediate presence to enjoy face-to-face communion? While 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians contain no express statements concerning the whereabouts of the Christian dead before the Advent, several considerations make the conclusion inevitable that in the early stages of his career, Paul regarded deceased believers as 'spatially' separated from Christ although still corporately joined to Christ.

(1) In 1 Thessalonians 4:16f. the kinetic imagery is uniform: there is a *κατάβασις* of Christ *ἀπ'οὐρανοῦ* (verse 16), and an *ἀνάβασις* of the dead (*ἀναστήσονται*, verse 16) followed by the 'rapture' of both dead and living (*σὺν αὐτοῖς ἁρπαγησόμεθα*, verse 17) [*ἐκ γῆς*] *εἰς ἀέρα* (verse 17) to meet their absent Lord. Then follows, it may be assumed, the formation of the triumphal train and an ascent into heaven.

(2) In 1 Thessalonians 4:17b *οὕτως* implies that it is after, and only after, the *ἀπάντησις τοῦ κυρίου* at the Parousia that either the living *or* the dead (together the subject of *ἐσόμεθα*) will be *σὺν κυρίῳ*, in 'spatial' proximity to Christ.

(3) If the Thessalonians were anxious primarily about the participation of the dead in the benefits of the Parousia, their grief would have been further allayed had Paul been able to refer to the present state of the departed as one of heavenly beatitude in the presence of Christ.

(4) The *ἅμα σὺν αὐτῷ ζῆν* of 1 Thessalonians 5:10 could scarcely allude to a *post-mortem* and pre-Parousial experience of proximity to Christ[56] but must be referred either to the period commencing at baptism[57] (in which case nearness to

between a preliminary *σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι* in a disembodied state immediately after death and the final *σὺν κυρίῳ εἶναι* (1 Thes. 4:17) in an embodied state after the Parousia.

[55] W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*,[5] T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh (1902) 196.

[56] See *per contra* P. Feine, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*,[3] Leipzig (1919) 370, 543; J. A. Sint, *ZKT* 86 (1964) 60, 73, 77.

[57] Thus R. C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ*, Alfred Töpelmann, Berlin (1967) 133f.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

Christ is not implied), or, as is far more probable, to the resurrection state following the Parousia (*cf.* Rom. 6:8b).

(5) As long as death itself could be conceived of as a punishment (1 Cor. 11:29f.; *cf.* 5:5), it must have remained improbable that Paul could have simultaneously regarded it as effecting a believer's glad reunion with Christ.

(6) The Christian's face-to-face vision of God (implying 'spatial' proximity to Christ) referred to in 1 Corinthians 13:12, was not to be experienced until *τότε*, that is, not until the Advent occurred when *τὸ τέλειον* would supersede *τὸ ἐκ μέρους* (verse 10).

(7) While, in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, death does not sever the *ἐν Χριστῷ* relation (note the expression *οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ*, 1 Thes. 4:16; *cf.* 1 Cor. 15:18) and thus separate the believer from Christ (*cf.* Rom. 8:38f.), in these Epistles it does not, as in 2 Corinthians 5, create the eschatological *σὺν Χριστῷ* relation and thus end a believer's relative exile from Christ (*cf.* 2 Cor. 5:6, 8).

The two passages in 1 Thessalonians which *prima facie* point to an opposite conclusion are, upon closer inspection, seen to be indecisive. The *οἱ ἅγιοι* of 1 Thessalonians 3:13 with whom the Lord Jesus comes are more probably angels than saints; but even if the expression did refer to saints or to saints and angels, the reference to '*all* the holy ones' shows that the coming alluded to must be either a judicial coming *subsequent to* the Parousia or a descent to earth *after* the meeting *εἰς ἀέρα* of dead and living Christians with the Lord. Believing as he did at this time, that the majority of believers would still be living at the Parousia, Paul would scarcely refer to believers who were with Christ in heaven as *πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι αὐτοῦ*. Secondly, in 1 Thessalonians 4:14 Paul asserts that 'through the power of Jesus (*διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*) God will bring with him (*ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ*) those who have fallen asleep'. Does this mean that God will restore departed saints to their living brethren when they accompany Christ *ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ* at his return? It should be noted that in this verse *ἄξει* is parallel to the earlier *ἀνέστη* and is therefore equivalent to *ἐγερεῖ*[58]

[58] If the whence and whither of the *ἄγειν* be pressed, it is more probable in the context that *ἐκ νεκρῶν* and *εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς* should be supplied than *ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ* and *εἰς ἀέρα*.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

(*cf.* 2 Cor. 4:14; 1 Cor. 6:14), that *σὺν αὐτῷ* adumbrates Paul's conception of Christ's resurrection as the *ἀπαρχή* of believers' resurrection, and that *ὁ θεός* is the subject of *ἄξει*, not *πέμψει*.

Precisely where, at this stage, Paul 'located' the dead in Christ prior to their meeting the Lord in the air remains uncertain; it sufficed for him to know that the dead were presently *ἐν Χριστῷ* (1 Thes. 4:16) and had not perished (1 Cor. 15:18) and would ultimately be also *σὺν Χριστῷ* (1 Thes. 4:17; 5:10). However, if he interpreted his own kinetic imagery of 1 Thessalonians 4 literally, he must have assumed, perhaps unconsciously, that departed saints were waiting in their graves or in Hades or Sheol until the dominical *κέλευσμα* was given *ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου* as the prelude to the resurrection transformation.

Concerning the state of *οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ* before the Parousia in this early period of Paul's thought, several observations may be made. First, the verb *κοιμᾶσθαι*, whose nine Pauline usages are, significantly, restricted to 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians,[59] seems to be basically if not exclusively punctiliar in meaning,[60] being employed not so much to describe the intermediate state *per se*, but rather to symbolize the Christian's manner of entry upon that state and perhaps to allude to the certainty of his exit from it. Certainly the apostle's use of *κοιμᾶσθαι* does not compromise his basic anthropological monism by suggesting that either an inanimate body or a disembodied spirit 'sleeps' until 'awakened' by the sound of the archangel's trumpet-blast. While, then, the term *κοιμᾶσθαι* does not in itself imply any psychopannychitic cessation of consciousness or insensibility, this euphemism for death would seem, in the context of Pauline usage, to portray Christian resurrection as a restoration of the person to full self-conscious activity and development after a period of depressed consciousness and reduced vitality perhaps spent in Sheol as a 'paralysed personality'. On this view, the intermediate state would be an interval of reduced consciousness—not of unconsciousness,

[59] 1 Thessalonians 4:13, 14, 15; 1 Corinthians 7:39; 11:30; 15:6, 18, 20, 51.

[60] In 1 Thessalonians 4:13 *τῶν κοιμωμένων* (D G K have *κεκοιμημένων*; *cf.* 1 Cor. 15:20; Mt. 27:52) may as easily mean '(concerning) those who, from time to time, fall asleep' as 'those who are asleep' (but *cf.* R. E. Bailey, *ZNW* 55 (1964) 164). Similarly, in 1 Corinthians 11:30, *κοιμῶνται ἱκανοί* may denote a (repeated) occurrence ('not a few are falling asleep', *obdormiunt*) and not a state ('several are sleeping', *dormiunt*). See, however, P. Hoffmann, *Toten*, 204f.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

suspended consciousness, or latent existence—which is but a shadowy counterpart of either earthly or heavenly existence.

The fact that all the Pauline uses of *κοιμᾶσθαι* are confined to 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians cannot be dismissed as inconsequential or coincidental, for it has already been shown that these two Epistles reflect the apostle's expectation of surviving until the Advent together with the majority or minority (respectively) of the Christians then alive. Never, therefore, does Paul allude to his own death as a 'falling asleep'.[61] On the contrary, when in 2 Corinthians 5 he is considering the implications of his own death before the Advent, he seems deliberately to avoid using the term in referring to the deprivative nature of death—in verse 1 death is a *κατάλυσις*, not a *κοίμησις*—and to substitute for the notion of *κοιμηθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ* that of *ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον*.[62] Paul may have discarded the *κοιμᾶσθαι*-concept because the dual idea of the believer's reception of the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* at death and his conscious fellowship with Christ after death seemed to him incompatible with the concept of waiting in 'sleep' until the Parousia inaugurated the *σὺν Χριστῷ* relationship and the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* was received. 'Sleep' foreshadows resurrection; 'dwelling with the Lord' presupposes resurrection.[63]

Thus far it has been argued that in three respects 2 Corinthians 5:1–10 marks a significant stage in the development of Pauline eschatology. But merely to isolate these altered eschatological perspectives is not to prove that the passage forms a dividing line in the progression of the apostle's thought: 2 Corinthians 5 could, conceivably, simply be an aberration rather than a watershed. An examination of the Pauline correspondence subsequent to 2 Corinthians, however, shows such a hypothesis to be unwarranted.

In vain does the exegete search Paul's Epistles written after 1 Corinthians for any indication of the apostle's expectation

[61] *Cf.* K. Hanhart, *The Intermediate State in the New Testament*, T. Wever, Groningen (1966) 76, 109f., 113, 120.

[62] If Philippians was written before 2 Corinthians, it was not in 2 Corinthians 5 but in Philippians 1 that Paul for the first time viewed death as an *ἀνάλυσις* to Christ's immediate presence where personal communion was enjoyed.

[63] Paul's belief that in his resurrection state Christ possessed a *σῶμα τῆς δόξης* (Phil. 3:21) would more naturally imply that *πρὸς τὸν κύριον* communion involved the believer's possession of the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* than that 'face-to-face' fellowship should be experienced between a bodiless spirit and its embodied *κύριος*.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

of his own survival until the Advent expressed in terms comparable to 1 Thessalonians 4:15, 17 or 1 Corinthians 15:51f. In Romans 13:11f., where Paul writes 'For salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed; the night is far gone, the day is at hand', he is appealing to the perpetual 'imminence' of the Advent (verse 12a) and the incessant reduction of the interval between the resurrection of Christ and his Parousia (verse 11b) as incentives to moral resolution and ethical earnestness (verses 12–14), but he does not indicate whether or not he anticipated being still alive when that interval expired. *ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς* in Philippians 4:5, like *ἡ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν* in Romans 13:12, is no evidence that Paul never discarded his expectation of witnessing the Parousia as a survivor. Since the phrase is verbally reminiscent of a passage in the Psalms where the nearness of the Lord is associated with his hearing and answering prayer,[64] it is probably to be linked with the following verse, supplying the reason why anxiety is misplaced and petitionary prayer can and should incessantly be offered. But even if it be interpreted as the ground for the preceding statement and therefore in a temporal sense ('since the Lord is soon to vindicate your cause, forbear'; *cf.* Rom. 12:18f.), the imminency and certainty of the vindication, rather than its immediacy, may be stressed. Furthermore, the *μετασχηματισμός* referred to in Philippians 3:20f. was for Paul no prerogative of survivors until the Advent but was the prerequisite for all, both living and dead, who would inherit the kingdom of God (*cf.* 1 Cor. 15:50–53).[65] While it is certainly true that the phrase 'our lowly body' more naturally applies to living persons than to decomposed corpses, it should be remembered that Paul is comparing the present inferior nature of human embodiment with a future glorious corporeality, not the state of his or the Christian's body immediately before and after either a future resurrection or a future transformation. Thus *ἡμῶν*, standing opposed to *αὐτοῦ* as humanity is to divinity and man's corrupti-

[64] Psalm 144:18 (*cf.* 118:151): *ἐγγὺς κύριος πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις αὐτόν.*

[65] In Paul's view, while only the dead are 'raised' (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. 15:52), both the living and the dead are 'transformed' (*ἀλλαγησόμεθα*, 1 Cor. 15:51f., of the living; *οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἄφθαρτοι* (1 Cor. 15:52) compared with *σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ* (1 Cor. 15:42), for the change in the dead). Thus the dictum 'the resurrection of the dead and the transformation of the living', if taken to imply that the dead are not transformed and the living are not raised, both distorts and preserves (respectively) the truth.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

bility to divine glory, may mean 'of us (mortals)' and not specifically 'of us (Christians)'.

Evidence is not lacking, on the other hand, to suggest that after the turning-point represented by 2 Corinthians, Paul continued to regard his survival until the Advent as less probable than his prior death. Romans 6:5, with its assurance that Christians are destined to experience a resurrection *ἐκ νεκρῶν* comparable to Christ's, seems to presuppose that Paul was anticipating a pre-Parousia death for himself and his readers. Again, in itself the argument of Romans 11 does not necessitate a prolonged interval before the Parousia and the prior intervention of Paul's death, but as C. H. Dodd comments, 'the forecast of history in chap. xi. is hardly framed for a period of a few months or years'.[66] The testimony of Philippians 1:19–26 on this point is indecisive. Here, reckoning with the possibility of his experiencing a martyr's death in the near future (*cf.* Phil. 2:23f.), Paul expresses his earnest wish that he might glorify Christ whether by living or by dying (verse 20). Subjectively, his desire tended to be that the glorification of Christ should be accomplished by his death, since that also effected his departure to Christ's presence. But although, in actual fact, either alternative—death or life, execution or release—could be his experience in the immediate and uncertain future, in verses 25f. (and possibly verse 19; *cf.* 2:24), perhaps optimistically, he expresses an assurance (*οἶδα*) of the successful outcome of his trial and therefore the preservation of his life, which he grounds (*τοῦτο πεποιθώς*, verse 25) objectively on the pastoral needs of the Philippian church (verse 24). Philippians 3:11 seems more conclusive, however. The element of doubt inseparable from *εἴ πως* testifies to Paul's self-distrust and modesty of hope, not to any uncertainty of his own salvation and certainly not to the improbability of his dying before the Advent. Compared with 1 Corinthians 6:14 ('God will raise us'), this verse states Paul's resurrection hope personally ('. . . that if possible I may attain the resurrection from the dead'), the apostle apparently assuming that he himself would enter the heavenly commonwealth after first dying. Here is no general 'whether we wake or sleep' (1 Thes. 5:10) but a personal statement which proposes no

[66] *The Epistle to the Romans*, Hodder and Stoughton, London (1932) 209.

alternatives. Paul's death, whether by martyrdom or not, would consummate his participation in Christ's sufferings during his life (*cf.* Phil. 3:10).

What of Paul's view, after 2 Corinthians, concerning the time of believers' transformation? It must be frankly admitted that after 2 Corinthians 5 there are found no explicit expressions of a belief in the Christian's resurrection at death. Whether Paul maintained the viewpoint of 2 Corinthians 5 can be determined only by examining his subsequent letters for traces of the continuing influence of his newly-formed conviction.

On no reading of the evidence can it be claimed that the theology of death reflected in 2 Corinthians 5 rendered superfluous the notion of the future Parousia, resurrection and judgment.[67] Yet the first two of these motifs do not seem to have been retained in an unmodified form.[68]

(1) With the drastic and permanent reduction of Paul's 'life expectancy' about the time of 2 Corinthians, his Parousia hope, although undeviatingly maintained until the end of his life, came to be less frequently expressed in his letters. It would appear to be less than satisfactory to account for this phenomenon simply by pointing to such external factors as change of audience and purpose, while ignoring the possible influence of a sharpening of focus in one section of the screen of Pauline eschatology. Paul's Advent hope did not, as is frequently asserted,[69] recede from the foreground to the background of his thought; the significance of *articulus mortis* became more clearly defined, making probable certain transpositions of emphasis.

(2) Where Paul's Advent expectation does find expression in later letters, it lacks some of its earlier intensity. The *nexus*

[67] See 2 Corinthians 1:14; Romans 2:5, 16; 13:12f.; Colossians 3:4; Ephesians 4:30; Philippians 1:6, 10; 2:16 (Parousia); 2 Corinthians 4:14; Romans 6:5, 8; 8:11; Philippians 3:11 (resurrection); 2 Corinthians 5:10; Romans 2:1–16; 5:9; 12:19; 14:10, 12; Colossians 3:24 (judgment).

[68] Logic might demand that resurrection at death should presuppose judgment at death, but nothing in 2 Corinthians 5:10 either demands or excludes the view that the divine assessment of believers' works precedes or coincides with their reception of the σῶμα πνευματικόν. For a powerful defence of the interpretation of this verse as a reference to a so-called 'particular judgment' occurring after the death of each Christian, see A. Feuillet, *Recherches de science religieuse* 44 (1956) 397–401.

[69] See, *e.g.*, A. M. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*,[2] SCM, London (1961) 149.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

existing between Paul's anticipation of dying before the Advent and this waning of intensity is less logical than psychological. While the probable intervention of his own death between the two Advents of Christ did not reduce the significance of the second epochal event, it was natural that the latter should be awaited less excitedly, not because he would no longer be a personal participant in the events of the Parousia but because it had ceased to be the next personally significant event in the eschatological timetable.

(3) In Paul's later description of the Parousia, its apocalyptic concomitants, previously so prominent, have largely disappeared. If, as the years progressed, Paul's eschatological expectation became more mystical in content and less apocalyptic in form, this dual process would have been hastened once it was recognized that one purpose of redemption—the individual believer's conformity to Christ's *εἰκών*—was achieved at death, not simply at the Parousia.

(4) The Advent has become, in the apostle's later writing, essentially the open manifestation of a presently hidden state rather than the inauguration of a new era. Once Paul arrived at his conviction that the transformation of his *σῶμα ψυχικόν* would occur at the Parousia or at death, whichever were the earlier,[70] and as long as he believed that his death would, in all probability, precede the Parousia, this latter event would be associated, not with the completion of the process and the beginning of the state of *μετασχηματισμός* but with the *φανέρωσις* of an already existing state which had commenced at death. Not only did the Parousia signify the arrival of the Saviour and the revelation of his wrath (2 Thes. 1:7f.; 2:8; Rom. 2:5; 12:19). It now also involved the *ἀποκάλυψις* of the glorious state of the sons of God (Rom. 8:19), the disclosure of present realities rather than the creation of new. The purpose of the Advent was not simply the glorification of the saints (2 Thes. 1:10) alive at the time, but in addition the manifestation of glorified saints (Col. 3:4).

How was the concept of resurrection affected by Paul's new insights? The fact that the term *ἀνάστασις* is never used by

[70] Admittedly, this is a rationalization of Paul's alleged later view. He himself may or may not have been conscious of the need or way to reconcile his new belief with his retention of hope for a Parousia.

Paul after 1 Corinthians does not imply that his hope of the resurrection of the dead was discarded in favour of a belief in the immortality of the soul, since Philippians 3:11 alludes to ἡ ἐξανάστασις ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν and references to a future resurrection of believers are not restricted to passages written before 2 Corinthians.[71] Rather, it may be suggested, Paul's view of resurrection was undergoing certain modifications. Resurrection was coming to be regarded less as a catastrophic corporate event lying in the future and more as a continuing individual process[72] inaugurated at baptism and consummated at death, with its outcome manifested at the Parousia. One reason for the difference between the doctrine of resurrection explicated in 1 Corinthians 15 and that portrayed in Colossians 2–3 may be found in the new theology of death-resurrection seen in 2 Corinthians 4:16–5:10. Once death came to be reckoned with in personal terms and as the normative Christian experience,[73] the way was prepared for resurrection to be viewed from an individual perspective, and therefore not merely as an event occurring for all Christians at a single moment in the future, but also, and particularly, as a process of spiritual renewal involving assimilation to Christ and the formation of the 'spiritual body' (2 Cor. 3:18; 4:16b; Rom. 6:4; 8:29; 12:2; Col. 3:1f.),[74] a process commencing with the individual believer's baptismal identification with Christ's death and resurrection (Rom. 6:4) and climaxed in his assumption of the image of Christ (*cf.* 1 Cor. 15:49) at the moment of death. Resurrection as a future event, it may be presumed, represented the Parousial assembling together of deceased and living Christians in union with Christ (*cf.* 2 Thes. 2:1) and their subsequent corporate completeness as the glorified Body of Christ (Phil. 3:11). The Parousia remained the object of Paul's desire as long as he lived since only that event, with its concomitant of resurrection, could effect collective con-

[71] See 2 Corinthians 4:14; Romans 6:5, 8; 8:11.

[72] *Cf.* G. Matheson, *Spiritual Development of St. Paul*, Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh (1890) 168–175.

[73] See D. M. Stanley, *Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology*, Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome (1961) 77.

[74] It is significant that in 2 Corinthians (1:22; 5:5) and subsequently (Rom. 1:4; 8:11, 15–17, 23; Eph. 1:13f.; 4:30), Paul's doctrine of the Spirit becomes more intimately related than previously to the concept of resurrection (see F. Guntermann, *Eschatologie*, 192f.; K. Deissner, *Auferstehungshoffnung*, 100–110).

summation at the same time as bringing individual completeness. Not the resurrection of the body *articulo mortis* but the resurrection of the Body *articulo Parusiae* brought full σωτηρία.

Finally, if the Roman provenance of Philippians be accepted, it can scarcely be denied that after 2 Corinthians 5 Paul continued to believe that the *post-mortem* condition of Christians was one of conscious fellowship with Christ in heaven. Philippians 1:20–23 indicates that while he awaited his trial, Paul's personal desire, other considerations apart, tended to be that he should glorify Christ by a martyr's death, which would involve his immediate passage into Christ's presence.[75] The τὸ ἀναλῦσαι of Philippians 1:23 is clearly parallel to the ἐκδημῆσαι of 2 Corinthians 5:8, while the σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι corresponds to the ἐνδημεῖν πρὸς τὸν κύριον implied in the Corinthian passage. 'Spatial' propinquity to Christ and personal enjoyment of his fellowship are not to be postponed until the Parousia but commence at the moment of death.

It can therefore be seen that because the altered eschatological perspectives of 2 Corinthians 5 were subsequently maintained by Paul, the eschatology of this passage cannot be deemed a temporary aberration in his thought. Nor, on the other hand, do the modifications of outlook and clarifications of doctrine evident in 2 Corinthians 5 constitute a radical revision of Pauline eschatology, since the cardinal concepts of his eschatology—Parousia, resurrection, judgment—were not abandoned, but (in the case of the Parousia–resurrection motif) merely redefined in the light of new insights.[76]

Positively it may be claimed that 2 Corinthians 5:1–10 marks a watershed in the development of Paul's eschatology.

(1) Probably owing to his recent and profoundly disturbing confrontation with death in Asia (2 Cor. 1:8–11), Paul, apparently for the first time, recognizes the probability of his dying before the Parousia.

(2) Whereas previously the apostle had regarded the resurrection of deceased Christians as transpiring at the Parousia,

[75] This is not to imply that the experience of being with Christ immediately after death was a special privilege reserved for Paul (and other martyrs) (*contra* A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, ET by W. Montgomery, A. and C. Black, London (1931) 135–137).

[76] It was therefore not a case of the retention of familiar terms while the ideas lying behind them were discarded (*contra* E. Teichmann, *Auferstehung*, 67, 74).

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660

in 2 Corinthians 5 he envisages his own receipt of a *σῶμα πνευματικόν* comparable to Christ's as occurring at the time of his death.

(3) By the time of the second Corinthian Epistle Paul has ceased viewing the Christian dead in general as resting in 'sleep' in the grave or Sheol until the Parousia and now anticipates his and therefore their enjoyment of the bliss of conscious personal communion with Christ in heaven immediately after death. These three modifications in secondary elements of Paul's eschatology were, in all probability, not unrelated. It remains to suggest that in Paul's *θλῖψις ἡ γενομένη ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ* (2 Cor. 1:8), possibly a drastic illness which curtailed his evangelistic endeavour in Troas (*cf.* 2 Cor. 2:12f.; 7:5) during his third 'missionary journey', is to be discovered the potent leaven under whose influence his conception of the 'intermediate state', which until the period before 2 Corinthians had been somewhat indeterminate, became fermented in a process of clarification whose outcome is represented by 2 Corinthians 5:1–10, where, owing to the relinquishment of his expectation of living until the Parousia caused by the *θλῖψις*, Paul elucidates the significance of *articulus mortis* for the Christian, a doctrinal innovation which in turn enabled him to clarify his view regarding the location and state of the Christian dead.

https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.30660