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OLD TESTAMENT THOUGHT

Before even beginning an examination of the material relevant to this subject, it is necessary to consider the problem of methodology. James Barr, in his book, *The Semantics of Biblical Literature*, appears to pose some serious challenges to the methods which will be used in this paper. These challenges need to be examined to determine if they have any relevance for the topic and if they demand a change in method. They relate to both the format and the sources used. Barr criticizes extensively such sources as JAT Robinson, Pederson, and Boman. It becomes necessary, therefore, to examine his criticisms, determine if they are valid, and then heed them. Barr questions the idea that Hebrew and Greek thought are a contrast in patterns.\(^1\) And yet, he does not find fault with the statements regarding the contrast between Hebrew and Greek thought, but rather with the manner in which these conclusions are reached. That is, he implies that he agrees with the basic differences between Hebrew and Greek, but he violently disagrees with the use

of linguistic evidence to prove these basic differences.\textsuperscript{2} Examples of weakness in linguistic method are the generalizations which are drawn from general Semitic language patterns to the Hebrew language itself.\textsuperscript{3} Another challenge is to the failure to consider the development of language. He claims this is especially prominent in Robinson's \textit{The Body}.\textsuperscript{4} Finally he challenges the practice of comparing the vocabularies of the two languages\textsuperscript{5} and then citing the results as proof of certain thought patterns. An example of this is Robinson's statement that the failure of Hebrew to have a word for the body with theological meaning reveals that the Hebrews did not differentiate between the body and the soul as did the Greeks.\textsuperscript{6}

Boman, in reviewing Barr's book,\textsuperscript{7} states that Barr has failed to grasp the difference between Hebrew and Greek thought adequately. He defends himself and Pedersen

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., p. 14.
\item Ibid., p. 18.
\item Ibid., p. 36.
\item Ibid., p. 34.
\end{enumerate}
by saying that they are studying ethno-psychology and not merely linguistics. They use linguistics to illustrate rather than to prove. While there are questions concerning methods and attitudes which need to be asked about Barr's book, his basic weakness appears to be overstatement. He has a valid point when he challenges the use of vocabulary to prove the differences between the two types of thought. In this challenge however he appears at times to forget that words are symbols of meaning. His desire to show that vocabulary must not be used to prove differences tends to fall short of proof. He appears to fail to understand when an author is using vocabulary to illustrate and condemns the use of linguistic material in the examination of the differences between Hebrew and Greek thought. In relation to this paper, Barr's warnings must be considered, but his argument does not invalidate the format or the sources which are used, since vocabulary is used to determine the individual thought concepts and not to compare and contrast the different thought concepts. The sources are still used because Barr seems to have misunderstood several and overstated the problems with others.

As Barr has challenged, it is not adequate to consider only the vocabulary of a people in the attempt to

---

8Barr, op. cit., p. 34.
discover their philosophy. Their major concerns, methods of thinking, and general thought patterns must be considered in order to comprehend adequately their thought. Hebrew thinking has a unitary aspect, but this unity must not be overdrawn to the extent that oversimplification occurs. The outstanding and unifying characteristic of Hebrew thought is its dynamic nature. The Hebrew sees the world in continual movement. Life is viewed as beginning and moving to a definite end. This is especially prominent in the Old Testament doctrines of creation and eschatology. The history of the world is in continual movement under the direction and control of God. This is also illustrated in the verbal patterns of the Hebrew language. Hebrew verbs often have an idea of movement connected even with stative verbs. The word "stand" appears originally to have meant "arise." The fact that the Hebrew language seems to have developed from a verbal system rather than a nominal system illustrates the dynamic character of their thought further.

Another aspect of Hebrew thought is the concern for time. The Hebrews are considered one of the earliest peoples to have a sense of history. Although the Greeks

---

had an idea of history as a result of their concern for what had happened, the Jewish concept of history grew from an awareness of what had been done for them and what was going to be done for them. They were more interested in what was coming in the future than in the facts and figures of the present. The Hebrew developments of a doctrine of eschatology and of apocalyptic writing graphically illustrate this. Philosophically, this is considered an interest in time rather than space. Time is considered an internal aspect of thinking and therefore psychological. The Jew was more interested in the inner life of a man than he was in the size and features of the man.\(^\text{10}\) This relates to the dynamic character of Hebrew thought. A man's inner thought processes are in flux, developing and changing. His features remain fixed to a much larger degree.

The Hebrew view of the experiential world relates to the concept of the word. The Hebrew saw the word as having a force or power of its own. This is similar to the thought patterns of her Semitic neighbors. Particularly in thought concerning the word of the gods, the Semites saw a word as having an extreme amount of power regardless of how it was used. This is shown by the use of

\(^{10}\text{Ibid., p. 206.}\)
and belief in magical incantations. The practice of writing an enemy's name on a potsherd and shattering the potsherd shows this belief in action. The Semite firmly believed that this was one way to destroy or hinder his enemy. This power of a word is seen in the Hebrews but not to the same degree. The Hebrew saw a word or a name to be more than just a word or a name, but it did not have a magical power. The experience was the word rather than the thing.11

From the Hebrew view of time and experience, it follows that the most important sense of a man was his hearing. A man's hearing and other senses played a much more prominent role than his reasoning ability in his everyday life. The Israelite interacted with his environment rather than withdrawing and reasoning about it. This too is seen in the vocabulary. The Hebrew stresses the heart and the emotions more than the mind in his literature. He views the world as being alive and not as mere material.12 This aspect of Hebrew thought partakes of the unity of Hebrew thought in that it too shows a dynamic character. The impressions of the senses, especially hearing, are much more fluid than the impressions of the mind.

---

11 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
or even the sight. This aspect is related to the interest in the word and in time. The relationship of all these characteristics reveals the Hebrew as an individual vitally aware of the world about him and dynamically concerned about how it works.

Once the thought patterns of a people have been established, any examination of their philosophy about a certain topic must consider the words which they use in their discussion. The most important and, at the same time, enigmatic word in the Hebrew language relating to this study is \( \text{nephesh} \). The transliteration, \text{nephesh}, will be used for the remainder of the paper. The Arabic cognates of this word mean "soul," "life," "desire and breath," and "odor." The Assyrian cognates mean "get breath," "be broad," and "life" or occasionally "person," "soul," or "living being." This class of verbs appears to be denominative since these verbs appear as nouns in all of the Semitic languages.\(^\text{13}\)

A. K. Johnson spends a great deal of time in his book, \textit{The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of}

Ancient Israel, developing the etymology of this word. Noting that the Hebrews saw a close relationship between psychical and physical functions, he looks for the physical, base meaning of nephesh. The cognate Accadian and the Ugaritic terms both originally meant throat or neck. References where nephesh is used with this meaning are Ps. 105:18, Prov. 23:7a, Jer. 4:10, Ezek. 24:21, 24, Jon. 2:6, and Job 41:12. The idea which is found in the Assyrian cognate of being broad may also add to the credibility of this explanation since the throat is capable of being broadened. Because the throat is a passage way for breath, the transition from throat or neck to breath is a natural one to make. Possibly II Sam. 1:9 and Job 41:12 illustrate this. While there is no clear-cut example of this, the fact that nephesh is used for perfume or odor as a form of breath lends strength to this view. Also, nephesh has a metonymical relationship to 9 2 which means nostril or quick nasal breathing. When this evidence is coupled with the cognates which mean breath, the etymology appears fairly certain.

The basic meanings of nephesh divide into two classes. The first of these refers to the animating prin-

ciple of the body which is common to both men and animals. The second class includes the ideas of bodily appetites and desires. This relates to the ego, the conscious center of desire or appetite. This is the word which corresponds to the Greek νησή. The first class carries concept of that which breathes, the breathing substance, the being which is distinct from basar (ψυξ flesh), although both rest upon a common substratum. It also means that which becomes a living being by God's breathing. When used without the noun or verb for living, it means the living being with life in the blood. The last use of nephesh in this class approaches that of a pronoun. It is used as the essential aspect of a man. Thus, it becomes used for man himself as a paraphrase for the personal pronoun. This is prominent in poetry and ornate discourse, such as is found in Ps. 124:7 and Isa. 3:9 and 46:2. The second class, desire or appetite, is used for the seat of the physical appetites such as hunger and thirst. It also means the seat of the emotions such as desire, abhorance, sorrow, and joy. Occasionally it is used for mental acts, for acts of the will, as equivalent to character, and as a combination of these meanings. There are traces of its

meaning "breath," but these are debated. The verb form of this word means "to breathe." It never appears in the Kal stem, but usually in the Niphal with the meaning of "to take breath" or "to refresh." Nephesh, in summary, has many meanings, but these center around the idea of the essential nature of a man. This essential nature has grown out of the ideas of breathing and desire coupled with the idea of rationality.

The Hebrew radicals \(\text{\textit{ruach}}\) which will be transliterated \(\text{\textit{ruach}}\) also have a bearing upon this study. Since nephesh carries the idea of breathing, this word is especially relevant. Ruach basically means "to breathe" or "to blow." The Syrian cognate means "to breathe"; the Arabic means to be windy; and the Aramaic means "wind," "breath," or "spirit." This is the only word in the Old Testament which is used for wind. Its Greek equivalent is either \(\text{\textit{πνεῦμα}}\) or \(\text{\textit{νεῦμος}}\).

16 \*\*BDB, pp. 659-661.

17 Kal stem is used for simple statements; Niphal has a reflexive sense.


19 \*\*BDB, p. 924.

The basic idea of breath, wind, or spirit finds expression in various specific meanings. Ruach means breath which comes from the mouth or nostrils, mere breath which today is expressed in the saying "hot air," a word of command, hard breathing as in anger, and a sign or symbol of life. When used with the meaning of wind, it refers to various winds such as a North wind or a dry wind, to air or gas from the womb, and to being vain or empty. This last use is frequent in Eccl. As spirit, ruach comes to mean animation or vivacity, courage, differing temperaments, and temper or disposition in distinction from nephesh or \( \text{\textsl{\textit{I}}} \) (heart).\(^{21}\) It also has the meaning of spirit in the sense of the spirit of the living, breathing being in all flesh. In this connection, it is related to God and His role in the continuation of life or the death of an individual. Ruach is equal to nephesh when used as the seat of the emotions. It is also equal to nephesh when it means the seat or organ of mental acts. This type of use is probably late and derived rather than original. It is used only rarely of the will of the individual. At times, it is used of moral character, or equal to \( \text{\textsl{\textit{I}}} \). When it is used as the Spirit of God, it inspires ecstatic activity, impells a prophet to speak in forth-

\(^{21}\) \( \text{\textsl{\textit{I}}} \), heart as symbol of emotions and will.
telling and/or fore-telling, imparts energy needed for a task such as occurs in Judges, or endows men with gifts of technical skills. This usage is late and refers largely to those skills needed in the construction of the temples.\(^22\)

When ruach is used as a verb, it means "to breathe" or "to blow," especially with the nostrils. It is not used in the Kal stem. It is an onomatopoetic word. When it occurs in the Hiphil stem,\(^23\) it means to smell.\(^24\) This can be seen in the fact that smelling occurs when breathing takes place. When this breathing is caused to take place, often it is for smelling. Sniffing, as a forced form of breathing, facilitates smelling. Ruach's greatest use is in a physical sense, but, like nephesh, it also has a spiritual or psychic sense. Primarily, it means wind, but it may mean the spirit of an individual.

Basar, the transliteration of ﺔ ﮞ ﻦ ﮩ, with its basic meaning of flesh naturally requires consideration. The Arabic cognate means "skin," and the Syrian and Assyrian cognates mean "blood relation" or a family relationship. It is used of the body, both animal and human bodies. In this connection, it is used for the flesh of animals which

\(^{22}\)BDB, pp. 924-926.

\(^{23}\)Hiphil stem has a causative or declarative sense.

\(^{24}\)Gesenius, p. 749.
is to be cooked and eaten. It is also used for the body itself. This may take the form of a synecdoche, a part used to represent the whole, as in Lev. 23:38. This use is similar to the use of nephesh as a personal pronoun.

Some have felt that this use is also contrasted with nephesh. BDB holds that basar is an antithesis to nephesh in Ps. 63:2, Job 14:22, and Isa. 10:18.25 Pedersen agrees with this in part. He feels that the Israelites were able to distinguish between the body and the soul and gives these three references. He concludes that they recognized two aspects of man, but that there was no distinction as to fundamental forms of existence.26 A. R. Johnson completely rejects this idea and considers basar to be used in the same manner in which nephesh is used, that is, as a pronoun. These are used in parallel expressions which Johnson considers to add or to reinforce the first line.27 While Johnson's views are valid, it appears that he has allowed his desire to demonstrate the unity of psychic and physical to dominate his thought. The ideas of parallelism and synecdoche must be considered, but they do

25 BDB, p. 142.


27 Johnson, Vitality, p. 40.
not answer the question why \textit{nephesh} is used first and then \textit{basar}. Pedersen most adequately understands the situation at this point.

Another aspect referring to the body, and in a way adding strength to Pedersen's case, is the concept of man over against God as being frail or erring. Man is flesh, and God is spirit. Therefore, man is temporary. The meaning of the cognates occurs in \textit{basar}'s use infrequently as kindred or blood relations. This occurs in contrast with marriage relations or tribal relationships. Finally, \textit{basar} is used euphemistically for the male organ of generation.\footnote{BDB, p. 142.} Thus, \textit{basar} emphasizes the physical aspect of man, but it does not drastically set up an antithesis to \textit{nephesh}.

Having examined both the vocabulary relating to the body and the general thought patterns, it becomes necessary to put these two together and develop a philosophy of the body. First, it must be stated that man is a unity of psychic and physical. This is seen in the fact that the words relating to the psychic, \textit{nephesh} and \textit{ruach}, both have physical connotations. The Hebrew emphasis upon the dynamic aspect of life also is found in this unity. This unity is illustrated by the way in which the members and
parts of the body possess psychic powers and are used to stand for psychic powers. These parts of the body are used as more than just the agents of the ego. They are often spoken of as engaging in personal behavior or as characterizing a personal quality. Thus, in Ps. 63:2, the Psalmist says that his flesh (basar) and his heart cry out to God. The use of hand in Biblical literature is another example of the personal behavior or quality of the parts of the body. In such verses as Ex. 14:8, Num. 15:30 and 33:3, the hand acts proudly or defiantly.

This unity of body and soul is expressed in the matter of death. Death is related to life. It is considered to be a weakened form of life itself. This is seen in that it is a scattering of man's nephesh much like the spilling of water upon the ground (II Sam. 14:14). It is also seen in the fact that man is felt to live on as a mere shadow of his former self (Isa. 14:9). Death does not affect only the body. When the body dies, the soul dies also. Thus, it is not a case of the body dying while the soul continues to exist in full strength. As was stated earlier, the nephesh is scattered at death. This

29Johnson, op. cit., p. 39.
30Ibid., p. 58.
31Ibid., pp. 89-90.
idea that both the soul and body die is seen in Judges 16:30 and Num. 23:10. This explains why men are often spoken of as souls in the Old Testament. It is not because the soul is the only part of a man which is worth saving. Rather, it is because the soul is killed just as is the body. When Num. 31:19 states that a certain number of souls were killed, this is not symbolism or synecdoche, but is a statement of fact. The unity is continued in death. Job 14:22 states that the soul feels the worm at work on the body. The soul remains with the body even in death.32

The relationship of the body to the soul during life further proves the unity of the body and soul. The body is the soul in its outward forms.33 That is, the soul is seen by the men around a man through his body. The actions and reactions of a man as a body are actually his actions as a soul. This shows up in the Hebrew's interest in the inner life of a man. The flesh is nothing more nor less than a weak form of the soul.34 Not in the sense that the flesh hinders the actions of the soul, but in the unity of being in that flesh is actually soul. Bodily sensations

33 Ibid., p. 171.
34 Ibid., p. 176.
are felt through the soul (Lev. 16:29, 31). The soul needs food and drink. When the body becomes weakened through lack of food or air, the soul is weakened.\textsuperscript{35} Not only can hunger be attributed to the soul, but even the sexual desire is attributed to the soul at times.\textsuperscript{36} Unlike many other systems of thought, the body alone is not responsible for the sexual urge. The soul is not limited severely to the body, but may be manifested outside the body at the same time that it is within the body.\textsuperscript{37} Perhaps the relationship between body and soul in both life and death may best be described as being on a continuum.

On one end of the continuum is the body: on the other is the soul. They are not opposing types of existence. There are some souls that are not flesh, but this is an extreme end of the continuum.\textsuperscript{38}

To an extent, the Hebrew may have conceived of a difference between soul and flesh. This is seen in Job 14:22, Isa. 10:18, and Ps. 63:2.\textsuperscript{39} BDB feels that these

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., p. 173.


\textsuperscript{38}Pedersen, \textit{Israel}, p. 176.

\textsuperscript{39}BDB, p. 142.
references use basar in antithesis to nephesh. However, it must be observed that these references all contain parallel expressions. Thus, the use of basar after nephesh may not be used for differentiation as much as it is used for variety. It appears that nephesh and basar are used as synonyms in these instances.\(^4^0\) This allows room for an awareness of some difference even if not a complete antithesis between basar and nephesh. This awareness is also seen in the contrast between flesh and spirit in the contrast between human and superhuman. The contrast is not made on the individual level, but God and men are contrasted as being spirit and flesh.\(^4^1\) This is, in fact, one of the meanings of basar. Basar emphasizes the fleshy limitations of man in contrast to the spiritual nature of God. Flesh describes man as being frail and liable to mistake, finite, in opposition to the infinite characteristic of God.\(^4^2\)

In summary, the dominant philosophy of the Hebrew in regard to his body is one of a dynamic unity. It is dynamic in that it is not a simple, static concept which sees the body as one type of existence. Rather, the body

\(^{4^0}\) Johnson, Vitality, p. 41.

\(^{4^1}\) Pedersen, loc. cit.

\(^{4^2}\) BDB, p. 142.
is integrated with the soul; this is not a simple relationship. Hebrew philosophy on the body stresses the unity of the body with the soul since it sees a man's body as being one with his soul. The dynamic relationship is not one of cause and effect or opposition, but is rather one of unity even as to existence. The body is a form of the soul. This idea affects all of his life and thought. He rarely approaches asceticism, and when he does it is not because of a dualistic view of his body and soul.
CHAPTER II

GREEK THOUGHT

Turning from the Hebrew concepts of the body to the Greek concepts, it is natural to examine the vocabulary that is used to develop these ideas. Looking first at ἵππος, which will be transliterated as soma, both the appearances and the meanings of the word need to be examined. The word appears as early as Homer, somewhere between the tenth and the ninth centuries B.C., and is apparently established in meaning by this time. The inscriptions, papyri, and Septuagint also contain soma. One of the earliest meanings of soma is "dead body" or "corpse." The idea of the body of either man or animal is the primary meaning of soma, and dead body may be the earliest meaning. Homer always uses soma in this sense, and the same idea often occurs later. Hesiod in the seventh century B.C. uses soma with the meaning "living body." It is also used with the meaning "parts of the body." Soma is developed in meaning by contrasting it with psyche (soul) and pneuma (spirit). The contrast with psyche is found in both the Classics and the New Testament; the contrast with pneuma occurs in both the apocryphal liter-

1 The basic meaning is soul or life.
nature, Fourth Maccabees, and the New Testament. A further aspect of the meaning of a living body is *soma* as the seat of mortal life. This meaning is found in the Classics and the New Testament both. Another early use of *soma* is to refer to a person much in the same way that a pronoun is used. An example of this occurs in a third century B.C. census list in the Flinders Petrie Papyri III. This seems to be a common practice both in the Hebrew with *nephesh* and in the Greek. Other meanings which appear later mean "slaves," "children," "troops," and "the body" or "entirety of an object," especially of the complete parts of the body. Again, it may mean any corporeal substances including plant bodies. The basic meaning of *soma* appears to be physical. The word means body with various secondary adjectives such as dead or animal. The early Greek writers and many New Testament writers use *soma* without any theological meaning. In fact, only Paul in the New Testament...

---


Testament uses soma with theological implications.  

The second word relating to a philosophy of the body is σῶμα, written sārxa from this point. Sārxa is found in Greek writings as early as Homer. While it occurs in inscriptions, it is not found in the papyri. It has a dynamic relationship with basar in, and as a result of the Septuagint. It also occurs in other Jewish literature such as a second century B.C. Jewish invocation for vengeance from Rheneia. In this passage, it is contrasted with pneuma.  

The meaning of sārxa has developed through the extensive use it has enjoyed. The earliest meaning of sārxa was "flesh," the soft muscular parts of the body. Homer uses it in this sense, and Theophrastus in the fourth or third century B.C. uses sārxa to mean the fleshly substance of fruit. Another early meaning is body, and in this sense it means the entire material part of any living being. The continuation of the development of sārxa from a strictly limited physical meaning to a wider meaning continues in the use of sārxa to mean the result of natural generation or kinship and of relationship, a col- 


6Moulton, op. cit., p. 569.

7Liddell, op. cit., p. 1585.
lective term equal to kindred. This use comes from its being the translation for basar in the Septuagint. A fourth meaning of sarx is "a corporeally conditioned being." This use emphasizes the physical aspect of man's existence. This meaning develops into the physical in contrast to the eternal or spiritual. The first of these two meanings simply states that man is body and flesh while the second meaning points out the weakness of flesh in comparison to spirit. This second meaning does not have any theological implications regarding the sinfulness of the flesh. Sarx is used to point up the idea of man as a result of natural generation and separate from the moral transformation of God. Natural abilities fall into this category of meaning. The last meaning of sarx relates to the part of man's nature that is a force for evil. This is the moral aspect of sarx.\(^8\) The use of sarx as an instrument of sin is not limited to Christian writers alone. Epicurus in the fourth century B.C. used sarx with this meaning.\(^9\)

Sarx, most frequently, refers to the physical side.


\(^9\)Arndt, Lexicon, p. 751.
of life. This is true even in Paul's writings. The Greek pagan authors know the use of sarx as an instrument of sin, but this is not its primary use. Although the meanings of sarx fall into two classes, flesh or physical, and affections or psychic, the original meaning appears to have been physical. The development of sarx is influenced greatly by the Hebrew basar through the Septuagint. From a strictly limited meaning of flesh, its use was broadened to mean the entire body. Then the Hebrew ideas of kindred and corporeality added meaning until finally the Christian writers found it natural to speak of sarx as having moral connotations.

The third Greek term having implications for a study of the body in Greek thought is πνεῦμα which will be transliterated pneuma. Because of the richness of the meanings and uses of this word in the New Testament and Christian writings, it will be necessary to limit the discussion of the term primarily to the pre-Christian meanings of pneuma. Pneuma occurs first in Anaxemender in the sixth century B.C. After this time, it comes frequently in the


11 Liddell, Lexicon, p. 1585.

12 Burton, op. cit., p. 494.
tragedies. This is not the only word which is used with a meaning of wind. The more archaic term is πνεύμα which is more physical in meaning and is used by Homer rather than pneuma. Pneuma also occurs in the inscriptions and papyri.13

The earliest meaning of pneuma is "blowing" or "breathing air." Aeschylus uses this meaning in relation to the wind, and both Plato and Aeschylus use this in reference to breathing. Aeschylus and Aristotle illustrate the use of pneuma with the meaning of breath, life-spirit, or soul. This is the idea of that which gives life to the body. A third meaning is spirit as a part of the human personality. When used in contrast with sarx, it denotes the immaterial part of man. Along this line, it also means the inner life and spiritual state. Pneuma develops the aspect of spirit until it comes to mean a spirit as an independent being which physical senses cannot perceive. This idea is not limited to Christian thought since it appears in the Stoics and in Plato's Cratylus. This independent spirit may be either God himself, good or at least not evil spirits, and evil spirits. A primarily Christian meaning for pneuma is the Spirit or that which differentiates God from that which is not God.

13Liddell, op. cit., p. 142f.
Most of the aspects of this use of pneuma appear only in Christian literature and are not pertinent at this point. There may be a spirit other than God which can posses a man.\textsuperscript{14} The meaning of pneuma has developed from wind to breath and finally to spirit. The last development has been greatly aided and enriched by Christian thought.\textsuperscript{15}

An adequate development of the Greek view of the body requires more than a word study by itself. The leading thought trends and the men who propounded them must be studied. Limitations as to source material and influence force the examination of these thought trends to begin with Homer. As one of the earliest Greek authors whose influence continued throughout most of Greecian history, Homer is an appropriate starting point. Homer in his epics developed a psychology which did not make a sharp distinction between a man's soul and his body. There was no clearly defined difference between man's physical nature and his spiritual or non-physical nature. A man's body was identified with his self rather than with his soul. Homer does not identify the body as being related to the psyche. Much of his thought concerning the body develops in his passages discussing death and the

\textsuperscript{14} Arndt, \textit{Lexicon}, pp. 680-684.

\textsuperscript{15} Moulton, \textit{Vocabulary}, p. 491.
after life. While some think that before Homer there was a doctrine of Hades which had substantial beings in it, there is not enough evidence to support this. Homer's concept of Hades held it to be a place where only pale images existed. It was a shadowy existence, less than life, and everything was insubstantial. This was where the soul went after death.

Around the seventh century B.C., Greek religious life came under the influence of an outside force that was to exert a great influence upon its thought regarding the body. This influence was a religion from the northeast of Greece and apparently had its origins in Thrace. Called the Dionysian religion from its major god, it was an innovation which came late to Greek thought. Dionysius, also called Bachus, was the god of wine and revelry. Its earliest advocates celebrated its rites in the mountains with excesses and orgies. The worshipers frequently beat themselves and ran through the woods dressed only in animal skins until they dropped exhausted. The entire goal of this wildness and excess was to escape

---

17 Stacey, Pauline View, p. 60.
19 Ibid., p. 47.
the cares and problems of everyday life. The advocates found a release through physical excesses.

As this type of thought developed, the idea of a soul, something more than just the body of a man, arose. This soul was to be freed from its bodily chains by orgiastic methods such as wine and ecstasy. When this religion began to enter Greece around the seventh century, the Greeks changed some of its more objectionable aspects, generally removed the excesses, and developed the implications of its thought. This group was known as the Orphics in Greece. The two major motifs of Dionysian and Orphic thought are the difference between the soul and the body, and the higher value of the soul than the body. The soul has a distinct and separate existence from the body. The soul has a divine nature, came from a divine source, and is much more valuable than the body. This type of thinking inevitably leads to a dualistic viewpoint of man. Man is not a unity of only one substance or nature. Nor is man a unity of two different aspects such as physical and spiritual. In place of a doctrine similar to one of these is posited the idea that a man is composed of two radically different substances. These two motifs were developed and the idea of a divine

\[20\] Ibid., p. 50.
soul being trapped in a human body was the logical outcome. Among the implications of this type of thought is that the body is sinful. Not merely is the body subject to sinful desires or temptations, but the body itself is sinful because it is not divine. The primary goal of Orphic religious thought was to free the soul from the body. The body hindered the activity and freedom of the soul and was to be controlled so that the soul could be released from its prison any time the individual desired. There are two ways to reach this freedom. One, the original way of early Dionysian practice, is through excess and drugs. The other, which the Greeks developed and which appealed to their natures, was through self-discipline and bodily control. This started the tendency to asceticism which became so prominent in later Christian thought. This type of asceticism is not fasting in order to gain some favor or to appease the wrath of the gods. This fasting is continual, and the individual's very religious life depends upon it. In fact, this is his religious life. 21

The influx of Dionysian thought through the Orphics was adopted and continued in the thought of many of the Greek philosophers. Although Pythagoras is known today

21 Ibid., p. 59.
for his mathematical theories, he was a leading philosopher in the sixth century B.C. His thought had a definite religious aspect, and a part of this aspect was his doctrine of the soul. Pythagoras held to the division of soul and body and was influenced along this line by the Orphic doctrine.\textsuperscript{22} In the fifth century B.C., Pindar developed his philosophy. He too was heavily influenced by the Orphics and continued the emphasis upon the separate and antagonistic existence of the body and soul.\textsuperscript{23} In these two centuries, Greek philosophy reached its peak with men, such as Heraclitus leading up to Plato and Aristotle. All the men immediately prior to Socrates appear to have held a dualistic view of man. Though this was developed in differing degrees and not all men held to an antagonism between body and soul, this dualism was the prevalent view.\textsuperscript{24}

This leads up to the time of Socrates. Due to the lack of his writings it is difficult to determine exactly what his views on any subject were. When it comes to examining his thoughts relating to the body, the most that can be found is certain references to immortality. Though

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., p. 61.

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., p. 88.

\textsuperscript{24}Stacey, \textit{Pauline View}, p. 68.
it might be possible to say that he too held a dualistic view of man, it is much safer to pass over Socrates and examine the thought of his student and successor, Plato.25 Plato has much to say in reference to the body and its relationship to the soul. Although he does not devote a discourse or any of his writings entirely to this topic, it is a recurring subject which is developed to a clearly defined doctrine. Plato's doctrine of the body and its relationship to the soul is developed from the early Orphics. Their primary tenets are his major emphases.26 In fact, it has been said that Plato supplied the philosophical basis for the emotional belief of the Orphics.27 Plato states his beliefs on the body in the Republic, Timaeus, Cratylus, Crito, and Phaedo. In the Crito, the body is inferior to the principle of justice in man. He lowers the position of the body and elevates a spiritual aspect of man.28 The Cratylus develops his doctrine of the body more completely. In fact, his similarity to Orphic thought becomes prominent. He states that the soul is the cause of life in the body, and the body perishes

25 Ibid., p. 71.
26 Stacey, loc. cit.
27 Moore, Religious Thought, p. 156.
when the soul fails or departs. The soul has a body as an enclosure to protect it. But, the body also acts as a prison to the soul. In the Phaedo, Plato continues the idea of the evil aspect of the body. He states that the sight and hearing deceive and hinder the soul in its acquisition of knowledge. The reality of the absolute is not perceived by the body. In another section, he compares the body and the soul. The body is visible, changing, mortal, and finally destroyed. The soul, on the other hand, is unseen, unchanging, divine, and indestructible. The soul is never voluntarily connected with the body, but is forced to dwell within the body as punishment for the wrongs of its earlier existence. Only the philosophers can enter to the gods.

By this brief discussion of his writings, it becomes evident that Plato had a dualistic view of man. Plato spends much more time discussing the soul than he does the body. His attitude toward the body is one of moderate asceticism. The philosopher was not to reject every physical pleasure, but he should never allow himself to

29 Ibid., pp. 61-63.
30 Ibid., p. 94.
31 Ibid., p. 113.
32 Ibid., p. 115.
become a slave to pleasure. Man's primary concern is with the vision of the soul, and he should care for the physical only to the extent that it is necessary in order to preserve his faculties.33

Even though Aristotle lived in the period immediately following Plato and was his pupil, he contrasts his views on the body with Plato's. Aristotle held that the body and soul were an indivisible unity. This appears to be a direct reaction to the dualism of Plato. A man was both body and soul because he was both form and matter. Neither can exist without the other, and neither can live without the other. This is related to Aristotle's views on form and matter. Matter only exists in potential until it has form. In the same manner, the soul gives unity and purpose to the body. Body and soul were considered to be nothing more than a philosophical abstraction drawn from the actual living man. Aristotle did make a distinction between the mind and the soul. Mind existed separate from the soul but was in the soul. The mind was indestructible. A mind could be conceived of as being outside of the body, but never a soul as being outside of the body. The mind does not have a personal immortality since only a few men were able to speculate. Thus, the

33Stacey, Pauline View, p. 74.
mind cannot be considered the same as a personal soul. 34

Frequently the problem of Plato's dominance over Aristotle in philosophy arises. The question is even more evident when the difference between their philosophies of the body is considered. Platonic dualism continued to influence Greek thought while Aristotle's unity seems to have found very few advocates. The same question arises in regard to the Middle Ages. One of the greatest reasons for Plato's acceptance in ancient Greece was that his thought was a continuation of the prevalent trends. As has been seen, Plato developed the Orphic thought which had been prevalent since the sixth century. Also, Plato's philosophy had an emotional basis in the thought of the people. Aristotle did not deal with matters of public interest and speculation, but with science and nature. This later reason helps explain Plato's dominance until the Crusades brought back copies of Aristotle's writings in the original language. Plato's thought dealt with man, morality, and God while Aristotle handled natural science. With theology being the primary interest in the Middle Ages, Plato naturally was the most interesting to the early church men. Even when men such as Aquinas began to use Aristotle's logic and methods, they retained many of

34 Ibid., p. 75.
Plato's thoughts and concepts on specific topics. Following Aristotle's time, Greek philosophy did not add any radically new ideas to their thought on the body. The Stoics theoretically held to the unity of man by positing a world soul, but practically their thought worked itself out as a dualism. This shows the Orphic and Platonic influence toward dualism.

The "Greek" viewpoint of the body can not be given simply. While a dualism dominates Greek thought, it is not the only ideal which has been held nor is it the latest. Homer, one of the earliest to discuss the body, and Aristotle, the last of the classic philosophers, both held to the unity of body and soul. Therefore, when it is said that Greek thought was dualistic, it is an oversimplification which is possible because of the popularity of Platonic thought. Recognizing that this is an oversimplification, that it should be labelled Platonic thought, Greek thought takes a dualistic view of man and regards the body as evil. The soul is of higher value and is actually divine. The body is temporal and acts as a prison and hinderance for the soul.

35 Moore, Religious Thought, p. 170.
36 Stacey, op. cit., p. 77.
CHAPTER III

A COMPARISON OF HEBREW AND GREEK THOUGHT

Greek and Hebrew thought on the body do possess some common characteristics and thoughts. The Hebrew ideal of the unity of man finds a parallel conception in both Homer and Aristotle. Homer combined the body and the soul. The actual basis for personality was not in one or the other, but in the union of the two. Although Homer states this, his greatest concern is with the physical aspect of the body. Homer also holds the insubstantial aspect of existence after death. This is very similar to Hebrew thought on Sheol. Aristotle also joined the body and soul, but his union was more on a metaphysical basis than experiential. Aristotle felt that the body only existed potentially until the soul gave it form. Also, the Hebrew is aware of a possibility of there being two aspects to man. These occur rarely and are never well developed, but the use of nephesh and basar in poetry may reveal some awareness.

However, these similarities are not as important as the differences. In fact, there are differences even in the similarities. Homer makes allowance for the exist-

1Stacey, Pauline View, p. 61.
ence of the body without the soul, but Hebrew thought usually holds that both body and soul cease to exist at death. The greatest difference is the contrast between unity and dualism. This appears to be related to some of the basic differences between Hebrew and Greek thought. The two greatest differences are (1) dynamic as opposed to static, and (2) concrete as opposed to abstract.² The Hebrew sees life as being ever moving and interrelated. Thus in his view of man and his body and soul, the Hebrew sees the body and soul as being interrelated, an integrated whole which works and moves in the world. The Greek sees the two aspects of man and makes an examination of each separately which encourages him to separate their existence. The Hebrew with his tendency to look at the concrete sees man alone. He sees the exterior aspect of man and does not especially concern himself with the possibility of there being another aspect of man. This does not mean the Hebrew is unaware of a man's thoughts and spiritual life. It means that he sees these and considers them as man and not as something inside of man. The Greek with his tendency to abstract thinking sees the same man and his thoughts, separates them, and then begins to speculate on man's inner life. He decides through speculation that

²Barr, Semantics, pp. 10-11.
man has something within him which brings these thoughts. Therefore, man has a soul.

While any contrast of these two systems of thought contradicts Barr's statement that they do not contrast naturally,\(^3\) it seems that such a contrast is necessary as a result of the possible combination of both types of thought in the New Testament. Although they do not contrast chronologically, they do contrast in content. Because of this contrast, the New Testament scholar needs to be aware of the differences. A knowledge of the two patterns of thought and their differences will aid in the determination of the influences upon the New Testament authors. It also will assist in deciding which factors in the writer's thought are unique. To be unaware of the essential differences would lead to an inadequate comprehension of the Biblical concept of the body.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 20.
CHAPTER IV

PAULINE THOUGHT ON THE BODY

When the Hebrew and Greek concepts of the body are considered in relation to the New Testament, one factor looms above all other considerations. This factor is Paul's thought. Paul has more to say than any other New Testament writer concerning man's body and its relationship to his spiritual life. This material occurs in his passages discussing anthropology. The list of books dealing with this aspect of Pauline thought is extensive, and JAT Robinson centers his entire discussion of Paul's theology around this aspect.¹

Although the basic meanings of the relevant Greek terms have been examined, the specifically Pauline usage of these words requires examination. Looking first at sarx shows that Paul used this word with the meanings common to his day. The most obvious of these is that of "flesh." "Flesh" is used to describe the soft, muscular parts of an animal or human body which is or recently was living. Paul used sarx with this meaning in I Cor. 15:39. The second meaning develops from the first and refers to the entire material aspect of the living being. A third

¹Robinson, The Body.
meaning refers to natural generation and the relationships which develop from this natural generation. The fourth group of meanings is used to contrast man with God. Man is referred to as a corporeal being and therefore different from God. This difference is not a difference within man, but outside him. Sarx occurs in this sense in I Cor. 1:26, II Cor. 5:16, as well as other passages. Another use of sarx which was mentioned earlier refers to the product of natural generation apart from the moral transformation of God's Spirit. This refers to the natural abilities, talents, and features derived from heredity. The best example of this use is in Phil. 3:3.

The usage which causes the greatest amount of controversy occurs primarily in Pauline material. This is the use of sarx with ethical implications, the meaning "opposition to goodness within man's nature." The central usage of this meaning is in Rom. 8. In determining the meaning of sarx in this passage, the development of the more common uses of the word must be remembered. Sarx has not always had an ethical implication. Also, its Old Testament counterpart, basar, had no ethical

---

2 Ibid., p. 20.

implication. While sin is associated with flesh, the indication is that flesh is not equal to sin. Flesh provides the easiest point of entry for sin, but the fact that it was created by God indicates that it is not in itself sinful. Flesh is the passive aspect with sin being the active force for evil. Sarx, though closely associated with sin is not inherently wicked.4

The other word which plays an important role in Paul's doctrine of the body is soma. Soma is as common as sarx in the New Testament, but its Old Testament equivalent occurs only fourteen times. Soma appears to have developed meanings similar to basar even though it was not the exact translation of basar. The basic meanings of soma are the body as flesh, as the whole man, as redeemable humanity, as that which is resurrected, and as the Church. These last two meanings are unique in Paul's writings and represent a definite contribution to the meaning of the word.5 Since soma is the translation of the same Hebrew word, basar, as sarx, it also shares many of the same meanings. These shared meanings are the external man, the presence of the man, the source of sexual power, the equivalent of what a man is or his personality,

4 Stacey, Pauline View, p. 162.
5 Ibid., p. 181.
a periphrasis for the personal pronoun, and man as being in this world. Although these meanings show the similarity of *soma* and *sarx*, there is a distinct difference. *Soma* by itself does not have the moral connotations which *sarx* has. J.A.T. Robinson sees *sarx* as meaning man in the solidarity of creation in his separation from God while *soma* means man in his creation for God. *Soma* expresses the wholesomeness or goodness of man's being created. *Sarx* expresses man's finitude which allows him to sin if he desires. Another meaning which has been mentioned for *soma* is that of the resurrected body. This use is found in I Cor. 15. The body of man's humility will be transformed in the same manner as the seed of wheat is transformed into the full grown stalk of wheat after being planted. The body of flesh is the forerunner of the resurrection body, and yet, the resurrection body will be different in many ways. The third idea, which Paul coupled with the ideas of man's body being for God and being changed, is that this change is continually occurring. The continual change takes place because of the solidarity of the race. Each time redemption occurs in an individual, one part of the whole is transformed from the old to the

---

new body and thus the change continues. This examination of Pauline terminology reveals no basis for considering Pauline thought dualistic even when *sarx* is used with ethical connotations.

Since terminology leaves no basis for dualistic thought, it is necessary to examine the sources of Pauline thought to see if they have dualistic presuppositions. Modern critical study of Pauline thought began with F. C. Baur of Tubingen. Baur had much to say about the sources of Paul's thought in general and made references to Paul's thought on the body. Baur's basic position was that Paul developed his doctrine as a complete contradiction to the doctrine of the primitive Church. This basis for Paul's doctrine must be considered if the critic is going to understand adequately Pauline thought. The basis for this belief came from the texts themselves. Looking at Acts, Galatians, and the Epistles to the Corinthians, Baur saw a conflict between two branches of the church. Because of the outstanding differences described in Acts and Galatians, he decided that the early church had a Petrine party and a Pauline party. The two Epistles to the Corinthians prove this by speaking of the divisions within the church. The Petrine party was composed of the

---

original apostles, and the Pauline party represented a Hellenistic group. Their greatest difference arose in relation to the redemption of man by Christ's work. Baur saw these differences as being smoothed out over a period of time due to exterior pressure from the Gnostics. However, Paul is primarily influenced by Hellenistic thought. This, of course, accounts for his doctrine of the body which Baur saw as being dualistic.

Baur did not have as much to say on Paul's anthropology as do several men who challenge parts of his view. Baur has been challenged by many of the men who have come after him. In fact, most of the theories regarding the origin of Paul's religion have arisen as a reaction against Baur's thought. The most telling criticism of Baur relates to his interpretation of the relevant texts. Machen criticized Baur for his failure to consider the entire record of the New Testament. According to Machen, the difference between Paul and Peter was not one of principle but only of practice. If Baur had examined more of the Pauline writings, he would have avoided this fallacy.\(^9\) Ritschl also attacked Baur's understanding of the early


Church. According to Ritschl, it would have been impossible for Baur to explain what held the opposing parties together. The external bond of a common faith in Christ would not have been strong enough to bring the negotiations and compromises necessary for reconciliation. Ritschl also claimed that there was much more agreement between Paul and the Jewish church than Baur held.\textsuperscript{11}

The first reaction to Baur's thought which developed fully into a tendency was the idea that Paul contained both Jewish and Hellenistic thought in his theology. The primary names and their books for this type of thought are Ludemann, \textit{The Anthropology of Paul}, 1872; Pfleiderer, \textit{Paulinism}, 1873; Holsten, \textit{Das Evangelium des Paulus}, 1898; and Holtzmann, \textit{Lehrbuch der eutestamentlichen Theologie}, 1897. Looking first at Ludemann reveals that he held the view that Paul's anthropology showed two conceptions of flesh. One of these came from Jewish thought, is simple and naive, and meant only man's natural being. The other conception was more exact and belonged to dualistic thought. In the second conception, sin comes from the flesh, and the flesh was the antithesis of spirit. This idea comes from Hellenistic dualism. This difference in conceptions of the flesh resulted in two differing systems of redemp-

\textsuperscript{11}Schweitzer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 17.
tion in Paul's theology. Pfleiderer, whose book has been translated into English, also saw an antithesis between flesh and spirit which was a result of Hellenistic thought. According to Pfleiderer, Paul was not satisfied with Jewish terms because they failed to adequately express what had happened to him at his conversion. Paul, then, began to avail himself of both the words and thoughts of Hellenism. These ideas had already found their way into Jewish thought, but the Pharisees always tried to avoid them. These two ideas were not joined and had little influence on each other. When Paul received his calling to the Gentiles, he found that Hellenistic notions were more valuable in his attempt to communicate to the Greek world. Because of this, Jewish thought lost some of the influence which it had had upon him. The basis for Pfleiderer's theory was found in both Paul's anthropology and his eschatology. Paulinism was the first step to the Hellenization of Christianity.

Holsten presents the most developed idea that the antithesis of flesh and spirit in Paul is from Greek thought. Greek influence found its way to Paul from every side but did not find its way into his thinking until

---

12 Ibid., p. 29.
13 Stacey, Pauline View, p. 42.
he was converted. Paul found it impossible to express his beliefs in the old Jewish terms. There is no suggestion that Paul adopted the Greek ideas for their own sakes. Rather, along with Pfleiderer's idea, Paul adopted Greek thought to facilitate his preaching of the Gospel. Thus, Hosten saw the Greek factors in Paul's thought as only a means and not Greek thought for its own sake.14

Another man who held to these views was H. J. Holtzmann. He too saw a large amount of Greek influence in Paul's writings. The greatest proof of this was Paul's use of spirit and flesh. According to Holtzmann, Paul used sárxi to mean the principle of sin. This was something the average Jew would never have done and which Paul could do only as a result of his conversion. Along with Pfleiderer, Holtzmann held that Paul prepared the way for Christianity to change from Semetic to Hellenistic thought patterns.15

As has been noticed, these men were very similar in thought and can be studied as a group. While there are aspects of these men's thought which are valuable, there is much that is questionable. Even though Paul no doubt adapted to his audience, Greek thought does not seem to be

14Ibid.
15Ibid., p. 43.
the basis for his thought. The problem with their approach was that they were content to look at Paul's words without examining the context and thought patterns of Paul. This coupled with their expressing doctrines of their own in Pauline words led them into thinking they were speaking of Pauline doctrines when they actually were expressing their own ideas. Thus, it was easy for them to find Greek thought in Paul simply because he used several words prominently and somewhat in the same manner as did the Greek philosophers. Anything which can not be explained as a Hellenization resulting from his conversion was considered a quirk of Paul's Rabbinic training. The greatest problem with this type of thought is that it has rejected only part of Baur's reconstruction and has not thoroughly examined that which they retained. They saw some Judaistic influence in Paul, but superficially decided that Paul was a Greek thinker when it came to certain key areas of his thought. Davies refutes this superficial view of Paul's being Hellenistic at the point of spirit and flesh by a three point test. The first of these is a theological test. If Paul had held to dualistic thought, his faith in the historic Christ would have been inconsistent. He would not have been able to accept

16 Schweitzer, Paul, pp. 40-41.
the idea that God came as man in Christ. The second test is that sarx is not used to oppose the ideal. Sarx is not the material in opposition to the ideal. Other words are used for this contrast. Finally, Paul does not use sarx to be a contrast between parts of a man. He uses it in an ethical frame of reference to point out the difference between man and God.17

Some of the well-known men who posited the idea that Paul's thought was Jewish rather than Hellenistic were Albert Schwietzer, R. Kabisch, H. Wheeler Robinson, H.A.A. Kennedy, H. St. J. Thackeray, and C.A.A. Scott. Schweitzer reacted so strongly against the men stressing Hellenistic thought that he stated that Paul was entirely Jewish in his thought. In fact, he thought the line between Christianity and Judaism was unbroken and that Paul did not feel Christianity was a new religion. Paul's eschatology showed both the continuation from the old and the arrival of the new. The only concession which Schweitzer was willing to make was that Paul had used Greek religious terminology.18 Kabisch laid the groundwork for Schweitzer with his examination of Paul's thought. In his examination, he decided that eschatology was the condi-

18 Stacey, Pauline View, p. 50.
tioning factor for Paul's ethic. This was picked up and developed by Schweitzer. Robinson considered the problem from the viewpoint of anthropology. He did this by comparing the psychological vocabulary of the Old Testament and Paul. He found definite advances on the Old Testament uses in Paul, but these were not from Platonic thought. Rather, Platonic thought hindered an adequate understanding of these words. Paul's thought came from Judaistic tradition and his own personal experience. H.A.A. Kennedy took a similar outlook. Paul was only concerned about spirit and flesh as a result of his own personal relationship with God. Paul's own experience and struggles with desires led him to speak of the flesh and the spirit. Paul's thought differed from Hellenistic thought in the essentials regardless of how much it might superficially resemble Hellenistic thought. Thackeray, who attempted to show Paul's dependence upon the Judaism of his own day, realized, in contrast to Schweitzer, the importance of Paul's conversion and the break which it caused with Judaism. In spite of the break with Judaism, Thackeray saw Paul's thought as coming from Rabbinism. C.A.A. Scott in *Christianity According To* 

Saint Paul develops the general evidence of Paul's Jewish leanings. These are his pride of race which he states several times, his uncompromising monotheism which no Greek held, and his concept of God. Paul's God was a God who was both knowable and had character which could be known. Both of these characteristics were not true of the contemporary gods. They were either unknowable or else of changing character. Other reasons for considering Paul's thought to be Jewish are his extensive use of Old Testament words and illustrations and his concept of the ideal society. Paul's ideal society included all nations. Though this may seem too universalistic for Jewish thought, there was a definite movement in this direction in the Old Testament.\(^{21}\) In relation to the concept of the body, Scott said that Paul changed the concept of the resurrection body from the Jewish concept of the same body to the idea that the body would be different.\(^{22}\)

Another author who has developed the case for the Jewish influence upon Paul has been W. D. Davies.\(^{23}\) Davies attributes the unique factors in Pauline anthro-


\(^{22}\)Ibid., p. 240.

\(^{23}\)Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*. 
ology to the Jewish influence of Rabbinic thought of Paul's day. His work is characterized by depth and thoroughness. Beginning with a reaction to Montifiore's idea of the difference between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism, he contends that Hellenism had influenced even Jerusalem. From here, Davies moves to the idea that Paul represented mainstream Jewish thought. The thought concepts which Montifiore attributed to an impure Judaism Davies showed to belong to orthodox Judaism. He points out that Paul's exegetical methods were Rabbinic and many of his attitudes also came from Judaism. In relation to anthropology, he sees Paul's use of flesh as derived from the Rabbinic idea of the evil impulse. While the good impulse idea is not evident in Paul, the tension between good and evil is seen in the contrast between sарx and pneuma.24

The view that Paul was primarily Jewish in thought is the prevailing view today. However, there are some criticisms which need to be considered. The first challenge is to an overstating of the case. Some authors have overdrawn the similarity of Pauline and Jewish thought. Schweitzer, for instance, failed to consider the change brought about in Paul's life as a result of

24 Stacey, Pauline View, pp. 53-54.
his conversion.25 Also, some have too clearly drawn the picture of the Judaism of Paul's day. Judaism in Paul's day consisted of several varieties. While thought patterns were similar, the author must be careful in defining Judaism.26 Finally, too exclusive a case for Judaism fails to consider the natural accommodation which any missionary makes to the culture to which he is sent. Knox argues that the Jews did this even in the synagogue and that it would have been natural for Paul to do the same.27

Another area which has been examined as a source of Paul's thought is the mystery religions. Because most of these flourished in Greece, they are often considered under Hellenistic influences. But, they are different enough from Greek thought to warrant separate consideration. Some of the early names associated with this type of thought were Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, 1910; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, 1913; and Loisy, The Origins of the New Testament, 1936. A more modern scholar who has stressed this type of thought is R. Bult-
mann with his emphasis upon Gnosticism. Reitzenstein was an expert in the literature of the Hellenistic age, and it was natural for him to look for examples of this type of thought in Pauline literature. He did not limit his search to words and phrases, but rather sought similarity in ideas. He came to the conclusion that even while Paul was a Pharisee he had been influenced by Greek mysticism. After his conversion, Paul prepared for his mission to the Gentiles by studying the Greek religions. Although Reitzenstein does not say a great deal about anthropology, he feels that Paul's view was similar to the Mysteries. Loisy found parallels between the themes of Paul's writings and those of the Mysteries. Paul was already under the influence of the Mysteries and when he was converted he saw this as the answer to the questions of the Mysteries. Paul transformed the Gospel into a Mystery religion. Bousset started with the thesis that the difference between Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity was greater than most recognized. This was seen in Paul's mysticism and his concept of Jesus which could not have been developed by a Palestinian Jew. Bousset felt that Paul made a cult out of the kyrios idea and developed it as Christ mysticism. He found Hellenistic mysticism very central to Paul's anthropology. Man was overpowered by spirit and the flesh opposed the spirit. Any idea that this contrast
in Paul could have come from the Rabbinic idea of good and evil influences was rejected. Bultmann finds many of Paul's ideas in Gnostic thought. Even though Paul opposed the Gnostics, he modified both his language and concepts to meet the Gnostic challenge. This was especially true in his Christology and in sacramental redemption. However, Bultmann holds to an anthropological unity for Paul even though Paul has an ethical dualism. Much of Bultmann's thought has been repudiated by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scrolls have many similarities to Gnostic thought in an exclusively Jewish community.

The basic criticism of the view that Paul derived much of his thought from the Mysteries is that it is too superficial an examination of the facts. First of all, there is a radical difference between the god-directed mysticism of Greece and Paul's Christ mysticism. In Greek mystic thought, the believer was assimilated in the god. In Paul, a man might become identified with Christ, but he never became a part of Christ's substance. Also, Greek mysticism was subjective in its redemption while Paul's redemption was objective. Something was done for Paul's man while the Greek earned his salvation

28 Stacey, Pauline View, pp. 44-45.
29 Ellis, Paul, p. 28.
through rites. Although these men considered eschatology important to their case, they could hold this only by ignoring the real characteristics of eschatology. Finally, there are simply too few analogies between Greek Mysteries and Paul's thought for there to have been any real influence upon him. 30

All of this discussion with its similarities to Greek and Jewish thought along with the preceding discussion on the sources of Paul's thought raises the question of whether Paul was in any sense unique. His uses and developments of soma reveal that he did have new ideas. What was the source of these ideas? Stacey definitely attributes this unique factor to revelation. 31 Others have recognized this influence. Thackeray stressed the importance of Paul's conversion, and Scott points to Paul's personal experience as influencing him greatly. This poses the problem of whether or not the Jewish and Hellenistic world had any influence upon Paul. Machen says that Paul had no sources for his writings. All of his religion came from Christ. 32 Ellis deals with the same problem when he says that the interpreter must be

30 Schweitzer, Paul, pp. 223-228.
31 Stacey, Pauline View, p. 16.
32 Machen, Origin, p. 173.
careful not to convert parallels into influences and influences into sources. While it is not the purpose of this paper to determine the relationship of revelation to the sources of Paul's thought, to go to the extreme of saying Paul received no revelation appears as radical as to say that Paul had no sources.

Ellis, Paul, p. 29.
While Paul has the most to say about man and his body, the rest of the New Testament does make certain statements. These statements will be examined only briefly. For a more complete treatment, Kummel should be consulted.¹ The first area which will be examined is the area of Jesus' sayings. The question is frequently asked whether or not Jesus valued the inner man more than the body. In order to see if this is a fact, the references which might lead to a dualistic view will be examined. Mark 8:36 merely refers to man's life and does not use psyche to mean an inner part of man. This comes from the fact that psyche equals the Jewish idea of life. Also, the context rules out any other interpretation. Another reference where psyche is used in the sense of life in the same manner in which nephesh is used is Matt. 6:25. Life and body are parallel terms for man's earthly existence and are not contrasting terms. Matt. 10:28 where Jesus says to "fear Him who can destroy the psyche and soma both in

Gehenna" must be interpreted to mean that God alone can destroy both earthly and heavenly existence. Laurin interprets this passage by saying that man has both a fleshly and spiritual soul. A stronger case for the higher value of the soul occurs in the scene in the Garden, "The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak," Mark 14:38. But even here, the implication is that man is still wholly answerable to God for evil. Even if a distinction is made here, it is only that man does not always strive wholeheartedly for or against God. The idea is the opposition of will to action rather than body to soul. Even in the most probable sources of dualistic thought, there is no trace of dualistic ideals in Jesus' thought concerning man and his body.

Another source of thought regarding the body is the Johannine writings. Although John does not use soma except for the crucified body of Christ, he does speak to the question of man's nature and whether it is dualistic. The fact that John's language is similar to Gnostic language, or drawn from Gnostic origins as Bultmann would say, makes his thought appear to be dual-

\[\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{R. Laurin, "The Concept of Man as a Soul," Expository Times, 72:131-134, February, 1961.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{Kummel, op. cit., pp. 31-34.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\text{Ibid., p. 74.}\]
istic. Like Paul's anthropological terminology, John is frequently misinterpreted. An examination of the key passages will reveal this. John makes such statements as man is "from beneath" (John 8:23), "that which is born of flesh is flesh and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John 3:6), and "unless one is born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:5). These appear to say that man is bound to this world as a result of his very nature and therefore a part of the conflict between the material and the spiritual. If this was true, John took for granted that a part of man is of more value to God. However, this was not true. These and the few other passages speaking about the inner man did not oppose those passages speaking about the outer man. Nor did any of these passages contrast the inner and outer man. They also did not hold the soul to be closer or of more value to God than the body, but rather stressed the distance of the inner man from God. Man is not bound up in any unchangeable opposition. There is no metaphysical dualism between God and man. But, man always opposed God. This opposition in not based upon his essential nature. He is not evil because he is flesh. Thus, it can not be

Ibid., p. 81.
claimed that John holds the body to be evil.\textsuperscript{6} John's concept of man is not dualistic even though he used language which has dualistic connotations.

The remainder of the New Testament fits the picture thus far developed. Man is held to be a unity. He did not sin because of his fleshly nature. The references to man refer to his inner and outer aspects as being equally sinful. When \textit{sarx} and \textit{soma} are used, it is not in opposition, but in parallelism. Thus, the remainder of the New Testament does not allow any basis for a dualistic viewpoint of man.\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{6}Ibid., pp. 72-74.

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., pp. 81-84.
In conclusion to this study, it will be helpful to give a brief summary of the Biblical views of the body and to relate these concepts to contemporary thought. Before even beginning, it needs to be recognized that the Bible develops no doctrine of man in isolation. Any doctrine of man or of the body develops in relation to material covering God's relationship to man. Looking first at the Old Testament view of the body, it becomes evident that even to ask the question of the Old Testament reveals a misconception by implication. The Old Testament does not consider man to have a body as separate from his soul. A better question might be the Biblical doctrine of man. However, as an aspect of its thought about man, the Old Testament makes some statements dealing with what a Greek understanding of man considered to be the body. First and foremost, Old Testament thought considers the body to be a unity of both outer and inner. There is no dichotomy. The body is a form of soul and the soul ceases to exist at death. Therefore the soul is in no way more valuable than the body. Man's body is an integral part of his existence and can in no way be separated from his soul. This is true even though the soul is
considered to have influence beyond the limits of the body. This idea of unity of body and soul is observable both in the language used to describe the body and its relationship to the soul and in actual statements about the body of man.

In the New Testament, one writer stands out above all of the rest in the amount of material which he devotes to the doctrine of man. Paul never considers the body as an abstract philosophical topic, but it is mentioned in his doctrine of man and his relationship to God. Paul begins with the Old Testament viewpoint that man is a unity and continues to develop his doctrine from there. Even though his language and phraseology at times might appear to express a dualism, this appears to be true only in a superficial examination. The tenor of Paul's statements and the statements themselves rule out any dualistic tendencies. Paul does have more to say about man though. His stress upon the spiritual reveals that there is more to man than just the physical. No one can properly interpret Paul and say that the body is all that there is to man. Paul leaves no room for such views as man's spirit being merely a man's influence. There is more to man than this. At the same time, the unity of man is stressed again as Paul emphasizes man's opposition to God both physically and spiritually. Another aspect of man's body is that it
has been made by and for God. In and of itself, it is in no way opposed to God. As JAT Robinson stresses, the body expresses the solidarity of man as created for God and this is certainly true of each individual. Paul points out that the body is one with the soul, that it is not just physical, and that it has been made for God.

The rest of the New Testament writers have little to say in relation to the body. What they do say does not contradict either what the Old Testament or Paul has to say. They too stress the essential unity of man. The body in no way is contrasted with the soul. They continue to stress this by a method similar to Paul's method. They point out that man opposes God both as an inner and as an outer man. There is no idea of the inner man deciding for God while the outer man opposes God. The remainder of the New Testament leaves no room for dualism. The Biblical doctrine of the body stresses that the body is not a separate entity, but that it is a unity of both body and soul. This unity is not a forced unity, but an essential unity which makes up an entire man. Indeed, if man could be conceived of as having body without soul, he would not be less than a whole man, he would not even be a man.

An examination of contemporary thought about the

---

1Robinson, The Body, p. 31.
body reveals definite misconceptions. As might be expected, the greatest problem is a continuing acceptance of the dualistic thought from Hellenistic philosophy. This occurs even in sources where it would not be expected. Klausner, writing as a Jew, disagrees with the idea of the unity of the body and soul. After stating this disagreement, he continues to cite Old Testament Scriptures to back his case. However, these verses have already been considered in the section on the Old Testament conceptions and have been shown not to support a dualistic tendency. Another author who takes a dualistic tendency in his doctrine of man is J. G. Machen. Machen stated that the body and the soul are two separate substances. He bases this upon the argument that to deny the separate existence of the soul is to deny man has a soul. This appears to be a failure to understand the profound doctrine of the Old Testament. To deny the unity of body and soul is to lower the value of the body rather than to exalt the value of the soul. This type of view when carried to extremes has serious implications for the doctrine of the incarnation. This type of view is

---


not limited to any one school of interpretation. More recent thought such as that expressed by Brunner and R. Niebuhr recognize the unity of body and soul more fully even though they may be weak in some areas. 4

An entire paper could be devoted to the contemporary implications of a unitary view of the body. The most obvious implication is that man is not body or soul, but both. If this view were held by the average man, much of the attitude toward man as being only material would be challenged. The idea that man is nothing more than bone and flesh cannot exist in the face of an adequate Biblical view of man. Another implication of this view relates to the intrinsic value of man. If man is more than just a body, he is to be regarded as being of the greatest value. This thought may develop from the idea that a man's soul is valuable. But, this type of thought also may lead to ignoring the physical condition of man and thus reducing him to less than he was meant to be. Finally, an adequate view of the body rules out any asceticism which is motivated by a desire to subjugate the body. When the body is punished, the whole man is

punished. All in all, the Biblical view that man is a unity will guard against many excesses.
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