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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem under consideration in this research was the theological implications of the Pauline concept of "flesh." In the various schools of theology this term often has been interpreted to fit the scheme of the particular theologian. The problem therefore centers in what Paul understood when he used this term. One of the focal questions is whether or not Paul always used this term with the same content of meaning. However, the essence of the problem is whether or not Paul always identified "flesh" with sin or whether he at times gave it an amoral usage.

II. JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

In view of the fact that the theological world has been so divided on the meaning of the term "flesh" and the available literature on the subject is of a limited nature, it seemed that an objective, inductive study of the problem was imperative. After a review of most of the existing literature on this subject, this writer felt that most interpretations were strongly influenced by basic presuppositions which defined "flesh" in accord with a
particular scheme of theology. Therefore, since there is a need for clearly understanding this Pauline concept in the light of sin, and of salvation from sin, this investigator felt the results of this study warranted a formal presentation.

III. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS LITERATURE

A review of the existing literature on the subject revealed that little research had been done on the relation between "flesh" and sin. This review disclosed that most studies had been done in the classical usage of "flesh" apart from the theological import of the term. It was found that most theologians, commentators, Bible expositors, and preachers touched upon the subject to a limited degree but their definition and explanation were far too limited to aid the student who is interested in an extensive treatment of the term.

Some Biblical scholars who have written on the subject have developed their doctrine of "flesh" purely from a prejudiced, doctrinal perspective. Others who have written in the field have lacked a background in the Biblical languages which would have been of value in an exegetical study. Some writers, prejudiced by theological commitments, have been unable to develop the doctrine objectively which makes their investigation less authentic than otherwise
could have been presented. Still others could have written on the subject but because of space, time, and other interests have elected to devote their labors to some other field of study.

John Wesley, one who would have been qualified for such research, chose rather to devote most of his time to advocating experiential religion. Henry E. Brockett, author of Scriptural Freedom from Sin, a strong refutation of W. A. Ironside's book, Holiness, the True and the False, has written without considering all the implications involved in the Pauline concept. While this work is a worthwhile apologetic, there are some instances where the Wesleyan position has been weakened rather than strengthened. Adam Clarke, the standard Methodist commentator, has developed the subject only to a limited degree, leaving much desirable information to be stated. Some men as Charles Hodge, John Calvin, C. I. Scofield, and J. G. Machen have written from a theological viewpoint and thus have colored the Pauline concept with their own preconceived basic suppositions. However, it must also be admitted that many Wesleyan writers have also written from the same perspective and they too have obscured rather than illuminated the Biblical meaning of the term.

Inasmuch as the available literature on the subject was insufficient to enlighten ministers and laymen who have
more than a superficial interest in the problem there was need for a study which would combine the classical, exegetical, and historical approaches to the subject.

IV. LIMITATION OF THE PROBLEM

The very title of this investigation limits the problem to implications of the Pauline concept. This area opens a wide field for research which this investigator had neither time, space, nor adequate experience to fully master. A study of the Greek word ἁρμαŞ outside the Bible would have been of value. An intensive study of the Septuagint would have also provided invaluable information. The depth of material which could have been found in the historical field has by no means been exhausted. There were other tempting areas of investigation such as the experiential and the psychological implications of the concept of "flesh." However, these extended implications have been set aside in this study.

This paper has been limited in its exegetical approach because an exhaustive study would have involved more time and space than were allotted this investigator. Therefore, the inductive-study results in each of the Pauline epistles has been given in summary form, rather than an individual examination of each reference that Paul made to the term.

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS
Flesh. The term "flesh," unless specifically stated otherwise, was interpreted in this study to be the equivalent of the Greek word ὄφρα. Thus, the two words "flesh" and ὄφρα are used interchangably.

Wesleyan. The term Wesleyan refers to those followers of John Wesley in his interpretation of the Scriptural doctrine of holiness.

Calvinistic. The term Calvinistic is used to denote those followers of John Calvin, the reformationist, who has wielded a strong theological influence until the present.

Keswickian. The term Keswickian in this study is used to denote those moderate Calvinists who in the past century have strongly emphasized the deeper spiritual life, and an intensive study of God's Word, and personal soul-winning.

Inductive. In this study the term inductive is used to refer to that method of Bible study wherein any term or concept is examined in the totality of its contextual usage and synthesized into a concise statement of meaning.

English Bible. The English Bible used in this investigation, unless otherwise indicated, was the American Standard edition, published in New York in 1901.

VI. METHOD OF PROCEDURE
An earnest effort has been made in this investigation to keep an objective attitude toward the data handled. To this investigator it seemed in most instances heretofore, that a certain theological position had been taken and then those scriptures which seemed to add support to that particular view were chosen for its authority. Such bias will never yield the true scriptural doctrine of any subject. To avoid such an error the inductive method of study was used. No true doctrine of the Christian church can ever be discredited by an honest, inductive study of the Bible, but rather it is the conviction of this investigator that many accretions both false and unwarranted could be removed by such an approach.

The investigation of the problem was begun with a survey of the general usage of the term "flesh" in secular Greek, in the Old Testament, and in the New Testament, with special emphasis given to the Pauline usage. This information was obtained from extensive reading in these respective areas. Thus, the data recorded in Chapter II is a resume of the extensive work done by scholars who have devoted more time and study to this particular area than this investigator could afford.

Chapter III was devoted to an inductive study of the Pauline usage of the term "flesh." An aid to this study was a standard Greek lexicon by which every instance of the
Pauline usage of the term was examined. After each instance of the Pauline employment was analyzed, the results of the study of each epistle was tabulated in summary form.

An historical survey of the various interpretations which have been given to the term in the several schools of theological thought was the subject of Chapter IV. This chapter sets forth a brief biographical statement of each man examined, his doctrinal position, and a critical summary of his position in the light of his particular theological school.

The final chapter of the study has presented the course which the investigator followed, a brief summary of the paper, some conclusions that were reached, and several suggestions for further study.
CHAPTER II

GENERAL USAGE OF THE TERM "FLESH"

To understand properly the significance of the Apostle Paul's employment of the concept "flesh," it was necessary, first of all, to present a general survey of usage prior to the period when the Apostle utilized the word in his epistolary writings. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter has been to set forth a survey of the utilization of the concept in secular Greek, in the Old Testament, and in the New Testament, with special emphasis on the Pauline implication. This historical background has given the proper content to the Pauline application of the word.

IN SECULAR GREEK

Etymology. The origin of the word ἁρπὶ in secular Greek is from ἀρπαζω, which is akin to σάβαζω, "to draw" or "to draw off." Thus it signifies what can be stripped off of the bones.1 Throughout the classical period of Greek literature ἁρπὶ was used in purely a physical sense and when it implied anything more than flesh it came to mean body by easy synecdoche. In the classical concept there was no

---

psychical or ethical connotation. In the physical sense, "flesh" was employed to represent the whole body as pieces of flesh—membrane. Then too, in the classical period "flesh" was used to mean the inside of leather or, at least, the interior of an outer covering. Further, in this same era "flesh" was applied to the pulpy substance of fruit.

Specific secular usage. In secular Greek, "flesh" was utilized specifically as a substantive of the human or animal body. In the writings of Homer, it was interesting to note, the singular form was used to denote a piece of flesh only, while in Plato and Aristotle the plural was used to denote the mass, the singular to describe the substance. The former differs from ἄγρια in that the latter has reference to slaughtered flesh as food.

In secular Greek the word "flesh" was also used to specify the body according to its substance. In this instance "flesh" is opposed to "mind." Because there is an easy synecdoche from "flesh" to "body," in many passages of

---


5 Ibid.
the ancient writers, one encounters difficulty while seeking to discover whether the writer was referring to "flesh" or to "body." 6

Epicurus employed "flesh" in a third way to mean, in a physiological sense, the corporeity in so far as it is the means, and by an easy turn of expression the subject, of sensation enjoyment or of sensations of the body. In no other writer does "flesh" seem to have been employed in this particular way. 7

One of the best synopses to be found of the secular employment of "flesh" is that of Ernest Burton:

is throughout the classical period a purely physical term, adding to the original sense of flesh, only and by easy synecdoche, the meaning 'body.' It is applied to men and to lower animals, but most commonly the former. It has no psychical or ethical meaning. It is not surprising, therefore, that no instance of πυτρα and ὁστός in antithesis has been observed in the classical writers, or indeed of ψυχή and ὁστός. 8

IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

In the Old Testament the word for flesh was נִבְלָם. Whatever may have been the primitive Semitic sense of this term, the clear indication of it in the Old Testament was

7Cremer, loc. cit.
8Burton, op. cit., p. 51.
flesh with the possible exception of one passage. The most basic function set forth in the Old Testament was that which equates flesh with the soft, muscular portions of the body which is living or was once living; both of man and beast. To designate those muscular portions of the body, the plural was most frequently employed.

Then by synecdoche, the term was used to represent the whole body. Very near to this utilization was a similar expression employed to specify the totality of a thing which, strictly speaking, has neither flesh nor soul.

By metonymy the expression designated one's kindred. Doubtless the basis of this application was that the body was thought of primarily as a product of natural generation. Usually in this context the expression was closely allied with the word bone as "flesh and bone."

By a further synecdoche the Hebrew word for flesh bespoke a corporeal living creature; sometimes referring to men only, sometimes of both men and beasts. The unit of speech referred to men and beast in common: "And all flesh

---

9 There are other opinions here.
11 Burton, op. cit., p. 68.
12 Cremer, op. cit., p. 345.
13 Burton, op. cit., p. 69.
14 Ibid., pp. 69-70.
died that moved upon the earth, both fowl and cattle and
beast....and every man."\textsuperscript{15} In other instances it was used
of men only: "And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed,
and all flesh shall see it together."\textsuperscript{16} At other times,
especially in predicate relationship, the term showed
emphatically the frailty which is characteristic of the
corporeal being as contrasted with the powerful Spirit of
God. Most clearly does the Psalmist set forth this idea:
"And he remembered that they were but flesh, a wind that passeth
away and cometh not again."\textsuperscript{17}

According to the data of this survey, little insight
was required to observe that \textsuperscript{17} was fundamentally and
prevailingy a physical term. The only departure from
a physical interpretation was the employment of \textsuperscript{17} by
metonymy for kindred and for a corporeal living being.
In the Old Testament the term never acquired a mental, moral,
or religious implication. Probably, the nearest approach to
such a meaning was the deep contrast between the weakness of
man and the power of God. But even in this context, the
weakness of the flesh was not something inherently evil.\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[15]{\textit{Genesis} 7:21.}
\item[16]{\textit{Isaiah} 40:5.}
\item[17]{\textit{Psalm} 73:39.}
\item[18]{Burton, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 70f.}
\end{footnotes}
As compared with the employment of the term "flesh" in secular Greek, the Old Testament was much more extensive in its usage. The very nature of the writing in the Old Testament forms the basis for an explanation of this phenomenon. On the basis of this survey of usage in the secular Greek and in the Old Testament, the next section has demonstrated an extension of usage as evidenced by the New Testament writers.

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

For the purpose of this study the New Testament has been divided into two sections: the Pauline section and the non-Pauline section. The purpose of this division was to investigate and set forth in summary form the New Testament teaching concerning "flesh."

The non-Pauline section. In the non-Pauline section of the New Testament the word "flesh" was used to suggest the soft, muscular parts of an animal body, living or once living.\(^\text{19}\) This is illustrated in the words of Jesus: "handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having."\(^\text{20}\)

The expression "flesh" in the New Testament was also

\(^{19}\text{Ibid.}, p. 184.}\)
\(^{20}\text{Luke 24:39.}\)
employed to mean the body as the whole material part of a living being. John spoke of those "who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man." By the "will of the flesh" the Apostle John implied a birth that was not of physical or natural generation.

Then by metonymy this concept was used as the basis or the result of natural generation. When the idea was employed to designate the result of natural generation, it sometimes was extended to include kindred. This particular extension of meaning was the first instance of "flesh" being used to imply other than a physical meaning.

In the fourth place, the New Testament writers designated as "flesh" any corporeally-conditioned living being. Although this corporeally-conditioned being usually referred to man, the expression may include all corporeal living beings and in any case designate the beings referred to not as human but as corporeal. This was seen in the remark of Jesus to Peter after the great confession: "for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my

---

21 Burton, loc. cit.
22 John 1:13.
23 Burton, op. cit., p. 185.
24 Ibid.
Father who is in heaven."\textsuperscript{25}

Then again, by metonymy the word was used for the creaturely side, "the corporeally-conditioned aspect of life, the external as distinguished from the internal and real, or the secular as distinguished from the strictly religious."\textsuperscript{26} Jesus said, "Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man."\textsuperscript{27}

Further, "flesh" in the New Testament was also associated with the product of natural generation apart from the morally transforming power of the Spirit of God. This means that all man receives through inheritance apart from the work of the Spirit of God is designated as "flesh."

At this point Burton says:

The term as thus used does not exclude, may even specifically include whatever excellent powers, privileges, etc., come by heredity, but whatever is thus derived is regarded as inadequate to enable man to achieve the highest good.\textsuperscript{28}

"That which is born of the flesh is flesh,"\textsuperscript{29} declared Jesus. Observation revealed that this concept, though found in the non-Pauline section, was most extensively

\textsuperscript{25}Matthew 16:17.

\textsuperscript{26}Burton, loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{27}John 8:15.

\textsuperscript{28}Burton, op. cit., p. 186.

\textsuperscript{29}John 3:6.
employed by the Apostle Paul.

Finally, the expression "flesh" connotes that element in man's nature which is opposed to goodness, that in him which makes for evil; sometimes thought of as an element of himself, sometimes objectified as a force distinct from him; this latter usage being, however, rather rhetorical.30

This meaning was expressed in the non-Pauline section of the New Testament only once and in that instance by the Apostle Peter.31 When this particular moral implication was given to the term "flesh" it should be understood that, were it not for some qualifying phrase, the expression could readily be translated "body."32

Pauline usage. The Apostle Paul employed every shade of meaning previously mentioned in this investigation but he amplified the ethical and semi-ethical functions of "flesh" to the extent that peculiarly they become his own. In fact, "flesh" as a dynamic, motivating principle is used only once in the non-Pauline section, and the extensive development of the thought was peculiarly Pauline.

Burton's argument. With regard to those usages of "flesh" which were peculiarly Pauline, Ernest Burton has explicitly defined the Pauline concept of "flesh" in its relation to sin and to the body. Concerning this existing

30Burton, loc. cit.
31II Peter 2:10.
32Burton, loc. cit.
It has often been contended that the *sārx*, which, according to Paul, is a force that makes for evil, is at the same time the body, and that it is to the compelling force of the body as such that, in his view, sin is due. If this is the case, he must logically, at least, hold that the touch of the flesh is essentially polluting, and that there can be no salvation except through the release of the soul from the body. That Paul associated the tendency to sin with the body is undoubtedly true and is evidenced by the very fact of his using *sārx* for the power that makes for evil. But that he identified moral evil, that he ascribed either to the flesh as physical or to the evil impulse which he called *sārx*, compelling force, seems thoroughly disproved by the evidence. It is often assumed that this view was the current conception in Paul's day. It is true that from before the time of Plato there is manifest a tendency to regard the body, as by virtue of its materiality, injurious to the intellectual and moral interests of man.  

It was quite natural for the Gnostics' *eisegesis* of Paul to contain a strong Platonic influence. There is some indication that the intellectual world could have furnished the Apostle with a type of Gnostic thinking but the final criterion for the Pauline implication of this word was to be found in the context of Paul's usage in the New Testament epistles.

A further point of importance, according to Burton, was that Paul not only failed to identify sin with the body but he also failed to give the "flesh" an all-compelling power which in no circumstance could be subjected.

---

At this point the Apostle gave the individual the alternative: the individual may yield to evil and be overcome or he may yield himself to the Spirit of God and be an overcomer. Therefore, according to the Apostle the final determining criterion was within the volition of the individual and not to some irresistible force apart from himself.

Burton argues that Paul believed that an individual would neither be happy nor complete without his body. Therefore, Paul did not share the sentiments of Plato, Seneca, and Plutarch that one must be rid of the prison house of the body to be complete, but rather the Apostle Paul believed the body itself was good but needed to be freed from some alien element within its basic structure.

With these arguments for the amoral quality of the "flesh" when it has reference to the body, Burton makes this conclusion:

We conclude, therefore, that while to Paul the body is inferior to the soul and needs to be kept in subjection, and while there is a force in man that makes for evil, which he calls sarx, yet this force is not the body, and neither it nor the body exercises a compelling influence for evil upon the soul of man.  

Vincent's analysis. Marvin Vincent defined "flesh" as human nature without the divine Spirit; as the state of the creature before or in contrast with his reception of the

---

34 I Corinthians 15:ff II Corinthians 5.
divine element whereby he becomes a new creature in Christ; as the whole being of man as it exists and acts apart from the influence of the Spirit. Not only does it properly characterize the lower forms of sensual gratification, but also all the highest developments of the life estranged from God, whether that be physical, intellectual or aesthetic.  

Vincent then described the flesh according to Paul's employment as having affections, lusts, a will, and a mind. The "flesh" is mortal, subject to infirmity, locally limited, and an object of fostering care by the individual.

In addition to this definition and description Vincent made two important notations from his extensive investigation of Paul's usage of the "flesh." First, Vincent affirmed that Paul did not identify flesh with sin. This affirmation was founded upon the fact that the "flesh" can be cleansed from defilement and that the Apostle lived in the "flesh" but testified that he was crucified with Christ. Secondly, Paul did not identify "flesh" with the material body nor associate sin exclusively and predominantly with the body. "Flesh" is the flesh of the living man

---


37 II Corinthians 7:1.

38 Galatians 2:20.
animated by the soul as its principle of life, and is distinctly
used as coordinate with man. The "flesh" embraces in an
emphatic manner the nature of man, mental and corporeal,
with its internal distinctions. 39 Although the "flesh"
is not sinful, since it has come into contact with evil it
is certainly tainted with sin. 40

Dickson's presentation. The basic assumption of
W. P. Dickson was that Paul had something which he wished
to express and that in each expression he had only one
idea to convey. 41 Most scholars agree that the Pauline
concept of "flesh" came to him from the Septuagint version
of the Old Testament. Although the basic idea of "flesh"
came to the Apostle from the Septuagint, the peculiar moral
aspect he employed was foreign to the Old Testament. From
a study of the moral and amoral functions of "flesh"
there were eight deductions which Dickson made regarding
the relationship between "flesh" and sin. Although some
of Dickson's deductions overlap previous conclusions this
investigator felt that Dickson's analysis was of sufficient
worth to repeat it in full.

39 Vincent, op. cit., p. 77.
40 Ibid.
41 W. P. Dickson, St. Paul's Use of the terms Flesh
and Spirit (Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons, 1883), p. 94.
1. No ground exists for the allegation that the Apostle identified "flesh" with sin. The expression "sinful flesh" would seem to preclude the equivalence of the two terms, for if they had been equivalent it would have been superfluous to add "sinful" to flesh. While the Apostle has spoken strongly of indwelling sin he has at the same time distinguished it not only from the ego but also from "flesh." So far apart are the conceptions of "sin" and "flesh" that the Apostle urged believers to be cleansed from "all filthiness of the flesh and spirit." This indicates that the "flesh," while not itself defilement, has undergone defilement as an effect of sin and stands in need of cleansing.

2. "The Apostle does not identify \( \sigma \alpha \rho \varsigma \) with the material body or outward bodily substance of man." When the term is extended it does not have reference to the bodily substance but to the whole man and by this ceases to be mere corporeal matter. The "flesh" with which the Apostle deals is that of a living man enlivened by the soul as a principle of life. And further, the expression is used as

\[1\] Ibid., p. 310.
\[2\] Ibid., p. 310.
\[3\] Romans 7:1, 18, 20.
\[4\] II Corinthians 7:1.
\[5\] Dickson, op. cit., 310.
practically coordinate with men.

3. "The Apostle does not identify matter, or the material side of man, with evil."\(^4\) In fact, the Apostle makes no reference to matter as such, nor does he use any language which approaches the language of the philosopher. Philo has attributed, in some of his interpretations, the Hellenistic dualism to the Old Testament, but this was not the view of the Apostle Paul. For the Apostle Paul preserves the ancient Jewish monotheism throughout all his writings. And finally, for the Apostle to acknowledge that matter was intrinsically evil would be for him to deny the sovereign supremacy of God and to deny that earthly organisms could render any distinctive service to God while they remained on the earth. But this would be contrary to his exhortation for men to present their "bodies a living sacrifice to God."\(^5\)

4. Sin, according to St. Paul, was not associated exclusively or predominantly with the body or with the sensous nature of man, although he sees in these its instruments or modes of manifestation.\(^6\) The Apostle summons his readers to "cleanse themselves from all filthiness of the

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 311.
\(^5\) Romans 12:1.
\(^6\) Dickson, op. cit., 313f.
flesh and spirit," as though the spirit as well as the "flesh" might undergo a defilement and stand in need of cleansing. Further, in another context Paul declares that one type of believer, at least, can be "holy in body and spirit." This frequent reference to the body is not due to its being regarded as the source of sin, but as being the seat or scene of sin's manifestation. So, the essence of Paul's usage was that the body was the physical object through which sin and sensuality were manifested but the neutral body was not invested with this sinful tendency.

5. The Apostle to the Gentiles showed that the "flesh" was the seat of sin but he did not state what was the psychological origin of sin. Therefore, sin is in the "flesh" but it did not necessarily originate in the "flesh." Concerning the sinfulness of the "flesh" Dickson says:

He [Paul] has nowhere pronounced the 'flesh' in itself sinful; he has nowhere declared it even to be, as such, the source of sin, though we sometimes find this proposition imputed to him; and still less has he propounded any theory, such as his philosophic expositors would ascribe to him, as to the principle or ground-form of sin consisting either in bodily matter, or in that aggregate of feelings and impulses associated with the bodily organism which constitutes the sensuous side of man.

---

49 Corinthians 7:34.
50 Dickson, op. cit., p. 315f.
51 Ibid., pp. 315-316.
While there is no explicit psychological explanation for the origin of sin, the very fact that the Apostle laid down the principle for the new life of the believer as being "no longer living unto himself" rather warrants the inference that the root of sin is to be found in selfishness rather than in the physical organism. This very principle of selfishness is to take an objective form in the man of sin "who opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God, or that is....worshipped."52

6. While the psychological origin has not been fully explained by the Apostle, it may be said that he does adequately explain the historical origin, and under no circumstance is there warrant to discredit that explanation.53 For the support of this point Dickson gives a lengthy argument for the exegetical genuineness of Romans 5-7 which this investigator has not found relevant to this research.

7. This doctrine of St. Paul had its basis not in speculation but in experience.54 This experience is based upon the facts given to him in man's history and in man's practical experience of life. Therefore, the "flesh" is not necessarily sinful for him because he realizes that

52 II Thessalonians 2:4.
53 Dickson, op. cit., pp. 317f.
54 Ibid., pp. 318-320.
God created everything "very good." However, this "flesh" which has existed since the time of Adam's sin has become tainted with sin through the constant contact which it has made with sin. The universal experience of this taint forms the explanation for St. Paul's close relationship between sin and "flesh." The creation existing apart from God has become almost equivalent to the creature's rebellion against God; and "flesh," which marks creatureship, connotes also its invariable empirical accompaniment of sin.

8. Finally, the universal experience of sin being predictable to the "flesh" has only one exception, Jesus Christ. He was made "in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin" but this does not warrant a statement that he was himself sinful, for in another place the Scriptures state that he was "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens." To summarize the Pauline usage it should be stated that the Pauline employment of "flesh" in many instances was the same as that found in the other books of the New Testament but there are two phases of meaning which are particularly emphasized by the Apostle Paul: "flesh" as

55 Ibid., p. 321.
56 Romans 8:3.
57 Hebrews 7:26.
the natural ability of man apart from the Spirit of God, and "flesh" as the dynamic principle of sin. With respect to these two peculiarities of Pauline usage, Burton, Vincent, and Dickson add considerable light. Burton evinced the dual fact that "flesh" is not of itself sinful and that the power of "flesh" is not an all-compelling force. The strong emphasis of Vincent was that neither "flesh" nor body is intrinsically sinful. However, it should be noted that this emphasis has some weaknesses which were treated in a subsequent chapter. The relationship between "flesh" and sin was most fully explicated by Dickson, who according to this investigator, has stated this relationship in a well-defined summary.
CHAPTER III

AN INDUCTIVE STUDY OF

THE APOSTLE PAUL'S USAGE OF "FLESH"

The significant uses of the term "flesh" have been set forth in the preceding chapter from the secular Greek, the Old Testament, and the New Testament. The purpose of this chapter was to examine in detail the employment of the term "flesh" in all the Pauline epistles, showing first by induction the phases of meaning utilized and then by synopsis the implications of the usage in each book. Where meanings and usages overlap, that particular implication of the term was stated but once except under modifying circumstances.

ROMANS

In the Epistle to the Romans, one of his most doctrinal Epistles, Paul made reference to "flesh" twenty-four times. From these twenty-four occurrences of the expression there are four classifications by which the employment of "flesh" in this Epistle were summarized. Three of these four classifications may be designated as amoral and void of theological significance: 1) the bodily organism, 2) natural generation, 3) humanity, the whole human race considered in its frailty.
But the fourth class has reference to an inner motivating force apart from the physical organism. This classification is basic to the theological implications of "flesh."

The bodily organism. The Apostle in writing to the Romans made at least one reference to the bodily organism as "flesh." In this instance he spoke of "circumcision in the flesh" and at this point of reference there is no ethical connotation. Since this reference is to the physical organism with no qualifying phrase there is nothing of theological import.

Natural generation. The second employment which was examined in Romans was that which designated the means of birth as the "flesh." Christ was spoken of as being "the seed of David according to the flesh." Abraham was also spoken of as the father of the Jewish nation "according to the flesh." Then, in a more comprehensive usage, the Apostle utilized the term to bespeak the whole Jewish nation as his "kinsmen according to the flesh."

In these references "flesh" was not viewed as having any moral or theological implication, but rather as a means

---

58 Romans 2:28.
59 Romans 1:3.
60 Romans 4:1.
61 Romans 9:3.
of propagating the race and furnishing the common unity of all those who belong to the order of human beings.

Humanity. In the third place, the Apostle employs "flesh" to point to humanity as a whole, especially emphasizing mankind's weakness and frailty as contrasted with the holiness and sovereignty of God. Emphatically St. Paul declared that "no flesh shall be justified" in the presence of God. Both Sanday and Denny agreed that this had reference to the weakness and inability of humanity to merit worth in the presence of God. Then too, they agreed that there is nothing of a moral connotation which would clarify the ethical implication of "flesh." In commenting upon this verse John Calvin said, "The word 'flesh' without some particular specification, signifies men."65

In another reference the Apostle also spoke of the inability of the "flesh." To the Romans he wrote that he spoke in accordance with man's method of speech because

---

62 Romans 3:20.


of the weakness of their "flesh." Since it was the custom of the Apostle to speak in spiritual language, he made apology for the utilization of carnal expressions. However, he accommodated his speech to the state of his hearers because the implication is that his hearers had not only a moral hindrance which perverted the practice of Christianity but also a defective experience which presented difficulties of comprehending the truth. Thus, they had a weakness in their constitution which was primarily physical and moral but also extended to the plane of the intellectual and emotional. Closely akin to this reference was one made in the following chapter to the weakness of their "flesh" to fulfill the law. The "flesh" is driven to admit "the law is good," that it points to the right way, but under the impact of temptation and the oft-repeated experience of failing, the "flesh" must confess its own weakness and inability to conform to the high requirement of the holy law.

Here again there was nothing found that specifically connoted the ethical quality of the "flesh." Rather, the implication of this classification was that humanity separated from God is weak, natural, and liable to sin.

66 Romans 6:17.
67 Romans 3:3.
68 Sanday, op. cit., p. 193.
A motivating principle. But within the book of Romans there is another quite significant reference to "flesh." This reference to "flesh" is the denomination of an inner motivating principle which coerces, influences, and corrupts all the actions of an unregenerate individual. Paul's conception of the inner motivating principle was set forth in seven different ways in this Epistle. The most basic conception is that "sin which dwells in the flesh." 69

Commentators have differed as to their interpretation of the phrase "in the flesh." The question is, should the text be rendered "Christ judged sin in the flesh," or should it be translated "Christ in the flesh judged sin?" Sanday held that "in the flesh" modifies "judged," which means that "in the flesh" Christ judged sin. 70 But Denny argued conversely, declaring that through Christ's death on the cross God judged the sin which was in us.

To substantiate his position he stated:

The truth is, we get on to a wrong track if we ignore the force of ἐμπραχμένος , or fail to see that God, not Christ, is the subject of ἀνεκπίθεν. God's condemnation of sin is expressed in His sending His Son in our nature, and in such a connection with sin that He died for it--i.e., took its condemnation upon Himself. Christ's death exhibits God's condemnation of sin in the flesh. . . But Paul does not mean that by His sinless life in our nature Christ had broken the power of sin at one point for the human race; but he means that in the

69 Romans 8:3.
70 Sanday, op. cit., 194.
death of His own Son, who had come in our nature to make atonement for sin, God had pronounced the doom of sin, and brought its claims and its authority over man to an end. 71

In the light of the latter interpretation, which this investigator judged the best, sin was conceived as an hereditary endowment of man which has been rightly judged and fully executed in the death of the Son of man. In this context, it was noted that in the condemnation of "sin" there was no special condemnation placed upon the "flesh" as such, but the alien element which had found rootage in man's nature was condemned. However, this foreign principle is more than a mere rootage, it has developed a law within the human members.

The law is spoken of as the "law of sin which is in my members." 72 This law or principle of sin is by no means dormant but is constantly active with lusts or desires. 73

When an individual is living under the dominion of this inner dynamic, he was said to be "living according to the flesh," walking according to the flesh," "minding the things of the flesh" or "in the power of the flesh." Without controversy one so living would be called fleshly, natural, or carnal.

71 Denny, op. cit., pp. 645-646.
72 Romans 7:23.
73 Romans 13:14.
But within this Epistle the Apostle did not leave the believer to despair but rather pointedly declared "we are debtors not to the flesh to live after the flesh." Further he added, "ye are not in the flesh in the sphere or power of the flesh but in the spirit if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." The first reference to spirit is that of the human spirit but the latter is a reference to the Spirit of God. The believer by the power of the Holy Spirit is enabled to live in accordance with his highest nature and is no longer dominated by the dictates of an inner law.

Summary. In this section it has been shown that the Apostle utilized the term "flesh" in at least four basic ways. He used it in its most elementary form to denote the bodily organism, then to indicate natural generation or kinship, and also in a comprehensive sense to include all humanity. The fourth and most significant usage was that which designated an inner motivating principle; it was this usage which carried the ethical connotation.

---

74 Romans 8:12.
75 Romans 8:9.
76 Sanday, op. cit., p. 196.
78 Romans, chapters 7 and 8.
FIRST CORINTHIANS

In the First Corinthian Epistle the Apostle Paul used the term "flesh" seven times. In these seven references there are at least five shades of meaning which were not utilized in the Roman Epistle. It was the purpose of this division to consider only those shades of meaning which were not previously examined.

Flesh and blood. One of the three times the Apostle speaks of "flesh and blood" is found in this Epistle. In this instance attention was called to the fact that this was one of the most basic uses of the term "flesh." Within this context the expression "flesh" means that "flesh and blood" which are natural, belong to a material kingdom and cannot inherit a kingdom which is spiritual and imperishable. There is some hint that there must be a transformation of the individual before entrance into immortality is possible.

Differentiation of flesh. Then "flesh" was also conceived of as distinct from the body and distinct from

79 I Corinthians 15:50.


81 I Corinthians 5:5.
some other kind of "flesh."\textsuperscript{82}

Since one person was delivered to Satan for the destruction of his flesh it was logical to assume that this "flesh" was distinct from his human body since in the Second Letter to the Corinthians the punishment is suspended and the man is apparently still alive.\textsuperscript{83} Although this individual survived the suffering it was quite likely that not only were his fleshly lusts destroyed but also he had some physical suffering also.\textsuperscript{84} Then by implication it was assumed that the destruction of the "flesh" was somehow intimately connected with the saving of the spirit in the day of the Lord.

But "flesh" is not only differentiated from the body of the human being but it was also made distinct from the "flesh" of other animals. Although reference was made to the "flesh" of birds, of beasts, and of mankind, the Apostle further declared "not all flesh is the same flesh."\textsuperscript{85} Then, it might be assumed, in a speculative sense, that

\textsuperscript{82}I Corinthians 15:39.  
\textsuperscript{84}Robertson and Plummer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 99.  
\textsuperscript{85}I Corinthians 15:39.
the "flesh" of animals was of a different texture and was affected by heredity and by sin in a different way from that of humanity.

**Sojourn of earthly life.** With a stronger parabolic implication the Apostle applied "flesh" to the sojourn of the earthly life. He declared that some shall "have tribulation in the flesh." This reference was somewhat of a spiritualized interpretation of the basic meaning of "flesh" but even here there was not an indication of an ethical import. This simply means that during the period of life there will be periods of persecution in which it will be more difficult to be steadfast. 87

**Faculties of the flesh.** According to the writer of this Epistle the "flesh" was conceived of as a spiritual entity because he spoke of marriage as a metaphysical union. When the writer said "they twain shall become one flesh" he did not mean that they would exist as two personalities in one body, neither did he mean the actual joining of the bodies of two persons. "Flesh" in this context is given a psychical implication which heretofore has been mentioned only as a motivating

---

86 I Corinthians 7:25.
87 Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., p. 154.
88 I Corinthians 6:18.
principle." Behind the actual material of the body, behind the visible man there was a spiritual entity which can participate in a symbolical or spiritual union. Thus, "flesh" assumed a highly spiritualized significance and bespoke a "motivating principle of life," the "ego," "the personality of the individual." Therefore, it was on the level of personality that two persons actually became one; when this union occurred there was no better terminology to designate that union than "one flesh." However, in this context there was no ethical implication.

Wisdom of the flesh. It was pointed out in this Epistle that not "many wise after the flesh" were called to follow Christ. 89 Not only those who were considered "wise" but also the "mighty" and the "well-born" found little calling in the grace of God. Those educated philosophers who were endowed with keenly developed intellects found that there were too many barriers standing between them and Christ. 90 This expression "according to the flesh" was used twenty times by the Apostle 91 and when it had any moral connotation it was directly related to the indwelling

89 I Corinthians 1:26.
90 Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., p. 90.
principle of sin. One of the common moral references was "walking according to the flesh" in which the individual was pictured as living under the power of the lower nature. Then, in this context "wisdom according to the flesh" would mean wisdom which was gained by, or in accordance with that principle of sin, or at best by unaided faculties of nature. But this wisdom gained in accordance with this lower principle has no merit before God but contrariwise tends to stand as an insurmountable obstacle to a proud, unyielding intellect. This wisdom "according to the flesh," natural wisdom, stands in direct contrast to that wisdom which comes from above by personal revelation. 92

Summary. In this First Letter to the Corinthians Paul spoke of "flesh" in two of the most basic ways: as "flesh and blood" and the different kinds of "flesh." Then, in a typical sense Paul spoke of the sojourn of the earthly life as a time of "tribulation in the flesh." In this Letter the fact was further established that "flesh" may have reference to a spiritual entity. Finally, what man may gain by nature is, in some respects, looked upon with contempt. Therefore, in this Epistle "flesh" has reference to a span of life in an earthly body which is different from other animals, to a spiritual entity which is capable of

92 Galatians 1:8-9; Ephesians 1:17-18.
union with another personality, and to gaining natural wisdom.

SECOND CORINTHIANS

In the Second Letter to the Corinthians the Apostle utilized the expression "flesh" eleven times. From these eleven instances of its employment there are two broad categories into which each reference may be placed; each reference may be considered either as "unclean" or as "natural" because of alienation from God. By "natural" this investigator has reference to those faculties which were given by God but used apart from the illumination of the Holy Spirit and thus tending to evil or self-will continually.

As uncleanness. There was one reference to "uncleanness" in this Epistle which had manifest significance. In the context of this reference the Apostle had pointed out that these believers were "restricted in their affections" and that this very restriction was brought about by iniquity, darkness, fellowship with unbelievers, and association with idolatrous temples. After enumerating the glorious promises made to believers because they were the temples of the Lord God, he exhorted those believers to cleanse themselves "from all defilement of flesh and spirit." This exhortation

93 II Corinthians 7:1.
94 II Corinthians 6:11-18.
"to cleanse" was in the aorist tense of the Greek verb which signified a completed action. The implication of this was that both "flesh" and spirit must be cleansed from some foreign element so that holiness may be perfected in a reverential fear of God. Emphasis should be placed not only upon the negative separating and cleansing but also on the positive devotion to God which leads to a progressive perfection of holiness. Therefore, the complete impact of the exhortation was that the cleansing may be completed sometime in this life but after that cleansing had been effected a progressive perfecting in holiness is the normal course of the Christian life.

Flesh as natural. Because "flesh" has been constantly analyzed in terms of Greek philosophy rather than in the light of Biblical revelation, John Laidlaw believed that herein was the basis for much misunderstanding of the Bible teaching on "flesh." This Biblical distinction for Laidlaw was not the inherent evil nature of matter and the intrinsic purity of spirit but rather a distinction between the earthly

96 The present tense may indicate an action in progress.
and heavenly, between the natural and supernatural. "Flesh is what nature evolves and spirit is what God through grace bestows." 98

With the suggestion of Laidlaw in view, an analysis of "flesh" considered as natural has become much easier to comprehend. This distinction between earthly and heavenly, natural and supernatural, temporal and eternal, seems to be the best interpretation of "according to the flesh" which this investigator has found. "According to the flesh" in this letter included all those earthly, natural, temporal judgments which man makes apart from the illumination of the Spirit of God. The Apostle spoke of making plans "according to the flesh," "knowing Christ according to the flesh," "warring according to the flesh," "glorying according to the flesh," "living according to the flesh." 99 Anyone living in this fashion would be designated as a natural man. The natural man lives his life in accordance with his own wisdom; even his knowledge of Christ is that knowledge apart from the illumination of the Spirit of God. This life of the natural man is governed by the demands of logic, the rationalization of all truth in accord with the marred image of God within himself which ultimately means the satisfying

of his desires on a horizontal plane. Therefore, the principle
governing the man walking "according to the flesh" was that
principle which set aside the wisdom of God for the natural
wisdom within the man himself. It has seemed evident to this
investigator that at best that principle was in rebellion
against God's will, God's plan, and all that God had in mind
for the redemption of all mankind.

Summary. In the light of this Second Letter to
the Corinthians both "flesh" and spirit were observed to
have been contaminated with some alien element gained by
nature, and to some extent, by contact with things unclean
themselves. Then, "flesh" was used to designate what the
whole of humanity was and did apart from the illumination
of the Spirit of God. This kind of humanity, it was seen,
thinks, reasons, plans, and lives apart from the Spirit
of God.

GALATIANS

The term "flesh" was found in the Epistle to the
Galatians sixteen times. These sixteen usages have been
synoptically designated as 1) natural versus supernatural
and as 2) an inner motivating principle which tends toward
evil and corruption. The justification for a further appeal
to these two previously named categories was the added
illumination which was found in this Epistle.
Natural versus supernatural. In the opening chapters of this Epistle the question was asked those believers, "Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" This question indicates that after one has begun a Christian life there are two dynamics which vie for mastery. These two dynamics may be designated as natural versus supernatural or "flesh" versus Spirit. The natural dynamic was that which turned one to his own efforts and abilities as a means of justification before God, while the supernatural was that continual dependence upon the merit of the blood of Jesus and upon the indwelling power of the Holy Spirit to guide into all truth and lead unto perfection. Calvin wisely characterized these natural, fading things which offer no genuine power.

"As the doctrine of the gospel brought to you the Holy Spirit, the commencement of your course was spiritual; but now ye have fallen into a worse condition, and may be said to have fallen from the Spirit into the flesh." The flesh denotes either outward and fading things, such as ceremonies are, particularly when they are separated from Christ; or it denotes dead and fading doctrine. There was a strange inconsistency between their splendid commencement and their further progress. 100

Thus, it would never have been possible for this fading "flesh" to lead into a spiritual relationship with God.

Although Burton declared that this reference did not have a

100 John Calvin, Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947), 0. 82.
definite moral connotation, it has seemed evident that the
natural can never engender the supernatural neither can
the fleshly mimic the spiritual. Although a moral
dynamic was not explicitly set forth in this passage,
to this investigator there seemed to be a definite moral
or, at least, a "semi-ethical" note implicit in the
context.

This natural-supernatural distinction was not only
made in the walk of the believer but it bore directly upon
his birth into spiritual reality. This natural generation
was displayed in the birth of Ishmael, the first son of Abraham,
who was born of Hagar through the natural wisdom of Abraham
and the natural means of human generation. But in contrast
to this natural birth of Ishmael there was the supernatural
birth of Isaac, the child of promise, by the agency of
faith. This historical instance the Galatian writer allegorized
to demonstrate the relationship of those who were born after
the flesh to those born after the Spirit. This allegory
has set in contrast those Judaizers who were dependent
upon the law and upon circumcision for justification with
those who through the Spirit were counting upon the merit
of the death of Jesus Christ. Calvin summarized the verse
in this manner:

101Burton, op. cit., p. 146.
With the same proud disdain do this posterity of Ishmael's, now, on account of outward ceremonies, circumcision, and the various services of the law, molest and vaunt over the lawful sons of God.102

These two instances have pointed to a very clear distinction between the natural and the supernatural as they are involved in salvation. Though not directly qualified in the context, these references imply that "flesh," even in an amoral context, basically has a moral connotation. This moral implication was designated by George A. Turner as "semi-ethical."103

A dynamic motivating principle. In the final section of the Galatian Epistle,104 Burton declared that "flesh" had a definite moral connotation. Not only was there a moral implication but Burton explicitly defined "flesh" as "that element in man's nature which is opposed to goodness and makes for evil."105 Therefore, it has been the purpose of this paragraph to further illuminate the meaning of "flesh" as an alien, motivating principle.

Since a spirit of liberty has been granted every true child of God, this dynamic principle was introduced as a foe to be observed very closely. This fleshly principle must

---

102 Calvin, op. cit., p. 142.
104 Galatians, Chapters 5-6.
105 Burton, op. cit., p. 292.
never be allowed to use the true liberty of the Spirit toward unspiritual ends. Calvin affirmed, "Liberty is not granted to the flesh, which ought rather to be held captive under the yoke, but is a spiritual benefit, which none but pious minds are capable of enjoying." John Wesley urged, "Take no occasion from hence to gratify corrupt nature." Further, Wesley enjoined: men must serve one another by love and thus show that Christ has truly made them free.

Concerning this entire section J. B. Lightfoot has given his view:

"This is my command. Walk by the rule of the Spirit and if you do so, you will not, you cannot, gratify the lusts of the flesh. Between the Spirit and the flesh there is not only no alliance; there is an interminable deadly feud. (You feel these antagonistic forces working in you; you would fain follow the guidance of your conscience, and you are dragged back by an opposing power.) And if you adopt the rule of the Spirit, you thereby renounce your allegiance to the law.

In this passage the Spirit is doubly contrasted, first, with the flesh, and secondly, with the law. The flesh and the law are closely allied; they both move in the same element, in the sphere of outward and material things. The law is not only no safeguard against the flesh, but rather provokes it; and he who would renounce the flesh must renounce the law also."

Thus, the Apostle Paul recognized that the "flesh"

---

106 Calvin, op. cit., pp. 153-159.
is antagonistic to the Spirit$^{109}$ and that the very desires of the "flesh" are contrary to the desires of the Spirit. This antagonistic force designated "flesh," in the original, has the article and this, indicated Burton, signifies that the term was used as an objective force for evil. The force of this passage was that these two objective forces—"flesh" and Spirit—are diametrically opposed the one to the other.$^{110}$

Because this principle is opposed to the Spirit, it will consequently manifest itself in a manner which is contrary to the manifestation of love. These manifestations are designated as "works of the flesh."$^{111}$ Once again Burton pointed out that the article used in this passage was significant because it objectified the evil. Further, he affirmed, it was evident that this was not the neutral use of "flesh" in this instance which has heretofore been utilized. Therefore, the use of "flesh" in this instance is something apart from the body; it is a principle which is dominating the body. This controlling factor, "flesh," uses the body in a sinful licentious way.$^{112}$ However, the

$^{109}$Galatians 5:17.
$^{110}$Burton, op. cit., p. 300.
$^{111}$Galatians 5:19.
opposite is true because the body may be used by the Spirit for the ends and purposes which He, the Spirit, has. The pressing question before the individual is will he allow the flesh or the Spirit to have the ascendency.

Thus far in this section the Apostle has revealed "flesh" as a foe which robs an individual of his true liberty, as an objective, antagonistic evil which constantly wars against the Spirit, and then he offers a stern warning to those who would sow in accordance with the fleshly principle: "he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption."113 This attitude of the Galatians of being unduly concerned for their own temporal welfare and unconcerned for the welfare of others was sowing to their "flesh." To live with this attitude means destruction. In addition to this Calvin showed that to sow to the "flesh" was to take regard for the needs of this present life without any concern for the future.114 There is also a close affinity between this statement and a statement made in the Roman Letter: "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall surely die but if ye through the Spirit do put to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live."115

113 Galatians 6:8.
114 Calvin, op. cit., p. 178.
115 Romans 8:13.
After a negative explication of "flesh" as an objective, antagonistic evil which is a foe to liberty and which sows the seed of corruption, the Apostle Paul then set forth a definite deliverance from this motivating principle by a crisis and continuation of crucifixion. The crisis of crucifixion is a definite time when this dynamic motivating principle, "flesh," is put to death. This crisis is viewed, by implication of the Greek verb, as a completed act. Therefore, all that belong to Christ must come to that point when the "flesh" is crucified and the Spirit is exalted to the position of mastery.

If this crucifixion of the "flesh" is to be valid, then the same attitude which brought about the death of the "flesh" must be constantly maintained. In this context the Apostle used the present imperative of the Greek verb to urge the believers to continue to walk under the power of the Spirit. Therefore, if the believer continues to yield to the inner urges of the Spirit he may rest assured that he will not lapse back into the former state of sin from which he was delivered. Concerning this spiritual walk Wesley wrote that one who is following the guidance of the Spirit in all things will not fulfill the desire of the corrupt

117 Galatians 5:16.
nature in anything. To this explanation Adam Clarke added:

All genuine Christians have crucified the flesh—are so far from obeying its dictates and acting under its influence, that they have crucified their sensual appetites; they have nailed them to the cross of Christ, where they have expired with him; hence, says St. Paul, Rom. vi. 6, our old man—the flesh, with its affections and lusts, is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. By which we see that God has fully designed to save all who believe in Christ from all sin whether outward or inward, with all the affections.

Therefore, from this objectified moral evil, the "flesh," the believer is to be delivered completely in this life, and, according to this Epistle, this deliverance is not natural but supernatural, not according to the ability of man but according to the power of God. This inner principle from which the believer must be delivered is by Adam Clarke designated "the old man" and by Lange it is made equivalent with the "sin in the flesh." The interested reader should mark the similarity between this Letter and the Roman Letter.

EPHESIANS

---

118 Wesley, op. cit., p. 696.
120 Ibid.
In Paul's Ephesian Epistle he utilized the term "flesh" six times. The content of these usages have previously been examined but the context of this Epistle adds new light to the previous employments. First, the faculties of the "flesh" received additional treatment in this Epistle; and secondly, a new light was cast upon "flesh" as pertaining to the physical body. The purpose of the investigator in the next two paragraphs was to set forth the further unfolding of the concept as found in this Epistle.

Flesh and the body. With reference to the body the Apostle declared that "no man ever yet hated his own flesh." 122 This was understood to be a non-moral reference. "His own flesh," Wesley took to mean the person himself. 123 Further, he added, the man nourishes and cherishes himself or feeds and clothes himself. The implication of this passage is that "flesh" is the basic being of the person, that it both needs and deserves a certain attention. Because the "flesh" needs and deserves attention, there is good basis for the exhortation to "love our neighbor as ourself." 124 The passage implies that there are basic drives within the very constitution of a person and that the satisfaction of these drives is not

122 Ephesians 5:29.
123 Wesley, op. cit., p. 719.
124 Matthew 22:39 (underlining mine.)
only permissible but expected since from the time of creation none has ever failed to do this.

Faculties of the flesh. The Epistle to the Ephesians also pointed out that there were faculties of the "flesh" which express themselves through spiritual modes. By these spiritual modes is meant "the desires of the flesh" and the "will of the flesh." Therefore, the "flesh" has both a will and desires which further evinces the fact of a spiritual entity behind the physical manifestation. This spiritual entity has mind, will, affection and urge either dormant or active which may be directed Godward or self-ward. When these faculties of this spiritual entity are utilized selfward then the person is said to be "walking according to the flesh," but when they are employed Godward, he is then "walking according to the Spirit."

Summary. In this Epistle the use of the term "flesh" for a spiritual entity within the personality is further explicated and also one instance is cited wherein the "flesh" was designated as an object of love rather than a foe to be cast out and crucified.

PHILIPPIANS

The word "flesh" was used in only one context in the Philippian Epistle that could cast additional light upon the present investigation: "we. . . have no confidence in
the flesh." Vincent has pointed out that "flesh" is that state of human nature prior to regeneration in which the whole being acts apart from the Spirit of God. Further, he affirmed this term characterizes not only the lower and sensual but all the highest attainments apart from God whether they be physical, intellectual or aesthetic. To trust in the "flesh" is to look to legal observance, circumcision, descent, or ritualistic strictness apart from surrender, faith, and the Spirit of God. Wesley also maintained that "confidence in the flesh" means confidence in any outward advantage or prerogative.

Summary. This Epistle indicated that a trust in the natural powers which are delegated to the individual is not enough to merit the gift of life everlasting. All that the individual can do within himself is to no avail unless the Spirit of God be sought and found.

COLOSSIANS

In the Colossian Epistle the Apostle made one reference to the "flesh" which was of further significance to this study.

---

125 Philippians 3:3.
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He referred to the "body which consists in the flesh." This verb should be interpreted as passive which would render the passage "the body of flesh was put off from you by the circumcision of Christ." This fleshly body certainly does not consist in the physical body, for no believer has ever stepped out of the physical body through the new birth. Thus, there must be some type of body which exists within the earthly body. It is the conviction of this investigator, along with several commentators, that this body should be equated with "the old man" and "sin in the flesh." But Wesley, to the contrary, applied this to putting away the sins of the evil nature.

EPISTOLARY SUMMARY

In the Epistle to the Romans the Apostle Paul employed the term "flesh" to indicate the bodily organism, natural generation, humanity in its weakness, and also an inner motivating principle. For the purpose of this investigation
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the last connotation was the most important.

In the First Letter to the Corinthians the Apostle utilized the term to bespeak flesh and blood, different kinds of flesh, this earthly sojourn, a spiritual being in the personality, and also a certain kind of wisdom. The establishment of "flesh" as a spiritual entity in this Epistle was important as further evidence of that designation in other Epistles. This "fleshly wisdom" mentioned in this Letter is the first unfolding of the inability of the natural, unaided man.

The Second Letter to the Corinthians points out the alien element within the "flesh" from which it should and must be cleansed. Then, a wide area of this Letter was devoted to describing both the inability and the futility of the "flesh." It is "flesh" as natural which, by some, is designated as semi-ethical.

The Galatian Epistle further explicates, substantiates, and illuminates the previous usages of the "flesh" as both natural and as a motivating principle.

An important addition of the Ephesian Letter was the positive note that was given to the "flesh." It was in this Epistle that the positive statement was made "no man ever yet hated his own flesh." This pointed out very clearly that "flesh" is not always to be hated, despised, and rejected.
The Philippian Letter further showed the inability of man's natural endowment when uninfluenced by the Spirit of God. Thus, it revealed that a trust in natural powers is not sufficient to merit the gift of God.

In the Letter to the church at Colossae the Apostle identified the "body of flesh" with the principle of sin or "the old man." This was probably the clearest identification of the "flesh" with the 'old man.'

The other Epistles of the Apostle Paul added nothing of importance to this exegetical study.
CHAPTER IV
AN HISTORICAL SURVEY OF
THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS

The preceding chapter was an attempt to show from an exegetical view the use which the Apostle Paul made of the term "flesh" in his Epistolary writings. A summary of that study revealed that the Apostle applied the term in different meanings which were determined by the context and the employment. Since there were different meanings given to the expression in various contexts, it was more than probable that there should arise a divergence of interpretations of the word. This present chapter has sought to show from an historical survey the various interpretations which have been given to the concept "flesh" by the diverse theological schools.

This chapter consists in three major sections: the Calvinistic, the Keswickian, and the Wesleyan. These particular schools have been chosen because they are representative of the major branches of Protestant conservatism. Although the Keswickian movement was established upon a Calvinistic premise, this investigator deemed it of importance because of the emphasis placed on Bible study, the Victorious Life, and the winning of souls.

CALVINISTIC
John Calvin (1509-1564). John Calvin was educated at the University of Paris through the sacrificial effort of his burgher father. After his graduation from the University he pursued a humanistic trend of thought taking great interest in piety and morals. Through the providence of God, sometime in the early thirties, Calvin experienced "a sudden conversion," "received some taste and knowledge of true piety" and then began the study of theology. At the age of twenty-six he had completed his *Institutio Christianae Religionis*, which since that time has been the text book of Protestant theology and an "arsenal for opponents of loose discipline or arbitrary government." Of all that could be written of the man, John Calvin, the fact still remains that he has had a breadth of influence on two continents and his historic work has proved to be an influential factor in one trend of present day theology.

There were at least three ways in which Calvin interpreted "flesh" which have proved enlightening to this study. First, he seemed to hint that "flesh" was to be identified with the physical. Although he did not explicitly state that sin and the "flesh" were synonomous, he made some severe

---
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accusations against the body which would lead one to believe that the body is inflicted with evil. He said, "that every thing in man, the understanding and will, the soul and body, is polluted and engrossed by this concupiscence." Then he quoted Peter Lombard as declaring that sin was in the "flesh," according to the testimony of Paul, not exclusively in the flesh but there because that is the seat of its chief manifestation. Then, according to Calvin, "Paul removes every doubt by informing us that the corruption resides not in one part only [body], but that there is nothing pure and uncontaminated by its mortal infection."¹³⁴

Secondly, Calvin made flesh one of the faculties of the soul which stands in constant opposition to the Spirit. He declared, "Under the term flesh, he [Paul] ever included all that human nature is, everything in man, except the sanctification of the Spirit."¹³⁵ In this instance he went on to say that both flesh and spirit belong to the soul and are constant faculties; the former referring to the natural, unregenerate portion while the spirit speaks of the new nature which is implanted by regeneration. This proposition formed the basis for the two-nature theory of the regenerate

¹³⁵ Calvin, Romans, op. cit., p. 267.
According to Calvin's view, Romans, chapter seven, represents that individual who has been regenerated and remains in a constant struggle all his life. This proves to be humbling to his soul and a constant reminder that he is nothing without the grace of God.

Thirdly, Calvin implicitly identified "flesh" with original sin or inherited depravity. In this identification he declared that original sin was a hereditary depravity which is obnoxious to the Divine wrath and which works in mankind all the "works of the flesh." Thus, there must be some connection between original sin and "flesh" if the latter can produce the "works of the flesh." Then further, Calvin taught that the Spirit is opposed to "the old man" and the "flesh." By "the old man" and the "flesh," which in this section it seemed he equated, Calvin meant that original sin, that inborn corruption which every man has by nature. The opposition by the Spirit of God is brought about by regeneration, and this regeneration is the only means by which the power of the "flesh" can be hedged.

From this presentation of Calvin's position it can readily be seen that for him there was no experience of de-
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136 Ibid., pp. 261ff.
137 Calvin, Institutes, op. cit., p. 275.
138 Ibid., p. 276.
liverance from inborn sin possible in this life. His primary weakness lay in a faulty view of sin, human nature, and the sovereignty of God. In the mind of Calvin sin represented anything short of the absolute perfection of God; but God has never purposed for men to be as He, himself, is or He would have made them such. Furthermore for Calvin, all of human nature is natural and thus "flesh"; and this flesh has nothing which to offer God; but God has urged men to present their bodies as living sacrifices to Himself. In his view of God's sovereignty Calvin overlooked the paternalistic motive in creation. If God chose to display his might over a helpless subject left to his arbitrary mercy, then Calvin's view was correct; but on the other hand, if God chose to "call out a people for his name" and be their father, then Calvin has placed the emphasis in the wrong place. To this investigator these three faulty views form the basis for Calvin's extreme treatment of the "flesh."

Charles Hodge (1797-1878). Charles Hodge was a Calvinistic theologian in the Presbyterian Seminary at Princeton, N. J. His own training at Princeton under Archibald Alexander greatly influenced his life and work. During his tenure of teaching he wrote several distinguished volumes among which are A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, The Way of Life (a commentary on the Pauline Epistles), and Systematic Theology. These writings not only gave him
praise in America but the flavor of his thought was appreciated abroad by many Scottish theologians.\(^{139}\)

In his **Systematic Theology**, Hodge stated four positions with regard to original sin which he identified with the "flesh": 1) it is the body, 2) it is seated in the sensuous nature of man, 3) the heart as distinguished from the understanding is the seat of indwelling sin, 4) "the whole man, soul and body, the higher as well as the lower, the intellectual as well as the emotional faculties of the soul, is affected by the corruption of our nature."\(^ {140}\) The last position, affirmed Hodge, was the right view, being the view which has been consistently held by the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. This latter view, which Hodge confessedly held, placed depravity in all the faculties of the human being. Thus, not only in the spiritual or psychological aspects of the personality but also the physical or bodily are possessed with the principle of indwelling sin.

In the scheme of Hodge this very principle was exhibited in the seventh chapter of Romans where it was clearly manifest to be a factor above the mastery of the believer. According to Hodge the whole theme of Romans, chapter seven, was


"sold under sin." So complete is this bondage to sin that no deliverance from it could possibly be expected:

A man may be subject to a power which, of himself, he cannot effectively resist; against which he may and does struggle, and from which he earnestly desires to be free; but which, notwithstanding all his efforts, still asserts its authority. This is precisely the bondage to sin of which every believer is conscious.  

Not only was there no deliverance from this principle of sin but the believer was driven to confess that "in me dwelleth no good thing." By this, said Hodge, Paul meant in his nature apart from Divine influence, in him apart from the work of the Holy Spirit, good was not to be found. Thus, to be in the "flesh" is "to be unrenewed and under the government of our own depraved nature."  

Finally, in quoting Martin Luther, Hodge boldly admitted that this war in the soul will be with believers as long as they live:

And this conflict between flesh and Spirit, he says, in his preface to this epistle, continues in us so long as we live, in some more, and in others less, according as the one or the other principle is the stronger. Yet the whole man is both flesh and Spirit, and contends with himself until he is completely spiritual.  

By this last statement he was seeking to say that there is no deliverance for the soul until it is transplanted out of

141 Charles Hodge, The Epistle to the Romans (New York) A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1890), p. 360.
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the body and until all the natural desires, feelings, and thoughts are gone, since all these are permeated by sin.

The actual difference between Calvin and Hodge was practically none, any difference which did exist being primarily that of terminology rather than content. While Hodge explicitly identified "flesh" with indwelling sin he was quite narrow in his interpretation of what it can imply in other instances. For example, in his context of thought one is made to feel that it is a sin to be finite, to be natural, to be mortal. Further, he did not take into consideration the fact that in the vast majority of times the word "flesh" is used, it has no moral connotation at all. Finally, in this state of finiteness, this unceasing battle against mortality, this temple of "flesh" in which man dwells must not have the same implication to God that it had to Charles Hodge, for if it had, surely he would not have "sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh." In conclusion let it be said that Hodge's view of "flesh" was altogether too narrowly defined to represent a thoroughly Biblical approach to the subject. His position has seemed to be a result of setting finite man in antithesis to the infinite, absolute God, which never was meant to be, because man is man and God is God.

John Laidlaw (1832-1906). John Laidlaw, for twenty-three years the professor of systematic theology in New College,
Edinburgh, was a distinguished conservative theologian, basing his teaching upon the thought of the Reformation divines. At all times his work was a combination of conservative theology with genuine scholarship. This theologian has been chosen because he has represented the Reformed thought in one of its most modified phases, because he evidenced clear insight into the problem involved, and because he added one significant insight which it seemed has been neglected by most writers on the subject.

Laidlaw has made differentiations in the term "flesh." To him it meant something physical, and it also had an ethical connotation. When "flesh" is used for one part of human nature as opposed to another part then it naturally stands for the lower part. "Not a single passage in the Old Testament can be adduced where 'in ' is used to denote man's sensuous nature as the seat of an opposition against his spirit, and of a bias towards sin." Thus, in the Old Testament and in all the references to "flesh" in the lower sense it has reference to the perishable, finitude, and frailty of mankind.

As to the ethical usage of the term, Laidlaw asserted that "flesh" denoted the principle, or the seat of the principle, which in fallen human nature resists the divine law, which is

\[\text{Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, } The \text{ Dictionary of National Biography} (London: Oxford University Press, 1917), \text{ pp. 411 to 412.}\]
contrasted with the mind or man's own higher nature consenting to the law, and which even in the regenerate makes war against the spirit. In an ethical sense, "flesh" is equated with "the old man," "the body of sin," and "the law in the members." These terms however, do not refer to the physical body, according to Laidlaw, for he has gone to great length to show the Greek philosophical basis which underlies such an idea. The meaning of "flesh" then is "that through which man, in his natural state, is descended from a sinful race, and inherits a sinful nature, and the term is used to denote that nature." 145 "Flesh" does have a certain connection with the lower meaning of human nature, thought Laidlaw, but he made no apology for that, declaring that the Holy Spirit has poured new content into old terminology. 146

One of the most important contributions of Laidlaw in the proper understanding of the term has been his true Biblical distinction between "flesh" and "spirit." After he had gone to considerable extent to show the Greek philosophical foundation upon which the hyper-calvinistic view rests, he then stated what he considered to be the Biblical position. To Laidlaw the proper distinction was not between "flesh" and "spirit" but the Biblical antithesis of earthly and heavenly, natural and supernatural. To him "flesh" is what nature evolves

145 Laidlaw, op. cit., p. 120.
146 Ibid., pp. 112-120.
but "spirit" is what God through grace bestows. Thus in this conception it could easily be seen that when "flesh" is ethically intensified to the utmost, it is still appreciably distinct from the notion of evil as necessarily residing in matter. This intensified meaning of "flesh" is used because it is in the "flesh," that is, in the course of life that man becomes contaminated with the principle of indwelling sin.

This presentation of the subject has great value in that it has made reference to one phase of the meaning of "flesh" which other writers have not opened as extensively as has Laidlaw. However, in his presentation he did not make any claims for the power of the Holy Spirit to deliver one from this tendency toward the natural and the earthly in this life.

Augustus Hopkins Strong (1836-1921). Augustus Hopkins Strong was recognized as one of the most distinguished Baptist theological leaders of his times. Strong's training included graduation from Yale and Rochester Theological Seminary with one year of study at the University of Berlin. After his study abroad he served two pastorates in Ohio until in 1872 when he was chosen president of Rochester Theological Seminary. At Rochester he was professor of
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Biblical Theology but apart from his class-room work he was very influential as a writer. Strong was chosen as a representative in the Calvinistic school for this paper because he has represented a mediating position between the extreme branch of Calvinism and some of the more moderate Arminians.  

Strong defined "flesh" in the words of F. B. Meyer: "The purely human element in man, as opposed to the divine principle." The best definition of "flesh", Strong set forth, was that of Julius Müller: "human nature as living in and for itself, sundered from God and opposed to him." In other than these statements Strong gave no clear definition of his own for "flesh." The best understanding of his concept was obtained from his treatment of "flesh" as presented in his doctrine of sanctification.

Sanctification was defined by Strong as "that continuous operation of the Holy Spirit, by which the holy disposition imparted in regeneration is maintained and strengthened." From this definition Strong drew three implications: 1) that after the governing disposition of the soul is made holy there is still remaining certain unsubdued tendencies
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toward evil; 2) that the existence of two natures in the believer gives rise to a conflict which lasts throughout life; 3) that the Holy Spirit enables the believer through faith to more fully and consciously appropriate Christ and to make conquest of the remaining sinful nature. For each of these implications Strong cited references in the Pauline Epistles as a basis for this position.

The position adopted by Strong was closely akin to Calvin's and Hodge's. However, the major difference was that Strong did not leave the believer to a hopeless endurance of the "flesh" but urges rather insistently upon his being diligent in growth through the Word, surrender, and prayer. It was precisely at this point that Strong acted as a mediator between two extreme positions.

John Gresham Machen (1881-1937). John Gresham Machen has been characterized as one of the foremost defenders of the Christian faith which any modern generation has produced. Machen was of strongly Christian parentage which is part of the explanation for his stern defense of the faith while at Princeton. Very definitely was Machen in the Reformed tradition as was evidenced by the tone of all his writings. In his last published volume, The Christian View of Man, Machen
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expounded Biblical truth according to the Reformed standards. The Christian Church of this era owes much to this staunch defender of the faith.154

In his exposition of "flesh" Machen denied that the physical, material "flesh" was evil or that "flesh" only referred to the bodily, animal nature of man. With these two negatives of "flesh" he proceeded to point out three uses of the term in the Scriptures: 1) "flesh" may have simply the physical meaning; 2) it may designate man in his weakness; 3) or "flesh" may designate man as lost in sin—as he is until he is regenerated by the Spirit of God. Machen affirmed that when "flesh" was used in an evil sense in the Bible, it was this third meaning which was most frequently given to the term. The designation of the term was not the lower part of man's nature but all of man's nature against the infinite.

Machen concluded that the Bible did not teach that sin was situated in the body but rather that it made human bodies its instrument and that the bodily appetites occasion much of the fall toward sin in temptation.155

While Machen made a long step for a Calvinist in denying that sin did not reside in the physical body, he was not as

explicit and as conclusive as one might have wished him to have been. From a study of Machen it was evident that he did not equate "flesh" with inborn sin.

René Paché (1904- ). René Paché, currently president of Emmaus Bible School at Lausanne, Switzerland, received his doctorate in Law at Lausanne. After a very skeptical period in his life he was soundly converted through reading the Scriptures. After his conversion he felt called to France to study in a Bible school for a year. Since his conversion the author has been actively engaged in preaching in most of the countries of western Europe. Besides his work in an Inter-Varsity Fellowship in France and Switzerland, the author of this volume, The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, has also written expositions on several Biblical books.

As was observed from this presentation the writer is of the Reformed tradition.

There were at least seven ideas which Paché presented with respect to the "flesh."

1. What was the "flesh" according to Paché? The "flesh," said he, is more than sin in us, it is more than the physical body; "flesh is our whole being, our SELF, all that we are by nature when not in Jesus Christ."

2. The "flesh" is by its very nature sold to sin. Here he quoted the testimony of the Apostle Paul: "I am carnal, sold under sin."\textsuperscript{157}

3. The "flesh" as it exists in the unregenerate man is unchanged in the believer. According to Paul the "flesh" is like an old tree with a graft in it: the old tree continues to send out wild sprouts. Because of such unyielding opposition the "flesh" exerts, God's only remedy for it is the way of crucifixion.

4. With this nature of "flesh" still in him the believer has the constant opportunity to live after the "flesh." Paul said, "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh . . . so then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh to live after the flesh."\textsuperscript{158} To those believers at Corinth this same Apostle wrote declaring that they were carnal and lived like other men.

5. The end of the believer living according to the "flesh" is spiritual death. The author declared that those who knowingly and willfully continue to grieve the Spirit by refusing the will of God, will ultimately reach perdition.

6. The deliverance for the Christian is through the Spirit's work in keeping the "flesh" in subjection. This

\textsuperscript{157}\textsuperscript{157} Romans 7:14.
\textsuperscript{158}\textsuperscript{158} Romans 8:5, 12.
process was likened to the gardener who has often had to trim back the shoots of the old tree until the new graft was able to grow and receive the strength from the tree. There is, according to Pache, no full deliverance from the "old man," but he must be constantly held in subjection by the Spirit of God.

7. The subjection is never complete and all through life there is a constant struggle against the power of the "flesh." There is no Scriptural authority for believing that the "old man" is completely dead and that the root of sin has been plucked out. Furthermore, he continued to argue that the seventh and eighth chapters of Romans show clearly that the "old man" is at constant work in the life of the believer. "Consequently up to the last, we shall have to make sure that our 'old man' is daily subjugated by the Spirit." 159

By way of analysis this writer has noted that although Pache has written extensively concerning the "flesh," he has omitted some Scriptural passages which add considerable light to such a study. He has exposed one phase of the term. His definition of "flesh" was based solely upon one passage of Scripture with no genuine consideration of what others had to add to the subject. Furthermore, Pache declared that "flesh" 159

\cite{Ibid., pp. 138-142.}
remains unchanged in the regenerate. But the Apostle asserted that "they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts." How could anyone be in Christ and in the "flesh" at the same time? Also, in saying that any teaching of entire Sanctification is unscriptural, he has not taken into consideration the aorist tense of many of the Pauline passages, the strength of such words as "destroy," and the expressed desire of Paul that the believers at Thessalonica be "sanctified wholly."

SUMMARY

What has been said concerning those in the Calvinistic school of interpretation of the word "flesh" can be summed up in four statements:

1. Many of the writers have identified "flesh" with matter without having made a thorough investigation into all the implications of the term.

2. A presupposed philosophical position, the sovereignty of God as opposed to the finiteness of man, has driven them to make certain statements which are decidedly extreme when the whole of Scripture is considered.

3. Most of the writers in defining the term have
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Given a definition which is suitable for only one or two aspects of the Scriptural meaning of "flesh."

Most of the writers did identify "flesh" with man's fallen nature or indwelling sin.

KESWICKIAN

Cyrus Ingerson Scofield (1843-1921). Cyrus Ingerson Scofield was converted in 1879 and was ordained in the Congregational ministry. He held successful pastorates in both Texas and Massachusetts. He is probably best known for his edition of the Bible, The Scofield Reference Bible.

In his definition of "flesh" Scofield quoted the definition given by J. H. Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Concerning this particular definition Scofield declared that Thayer limited the ethically bad sense of the word "flesh" to the soul and that the body was excluded. If the definition of "flesh" were a mere lexical question, this definition given by Thayer would settle the question, however, Scofield pointed out that the true definition of the term should be based upon the Apostle's usage of it in the Scriptures. His critique of Thayer's definition included these three statements:

It is submitted:
1. that Thayer's qualification, 'expressly or tacitly opposed to the Spirit of God' is too limiting.
2. ὅσαλος, the 'flesh,' in this moral sense, is never in Scripture said to be bad because 'apart from divine influence.'
3. and Thayer's definition makes ὅσαλος in the bad sense to mean only 'mere human nature'; Scripture not only never speaks of a fleshly nature, but in Paul's characteristic discussions ὅσαλος is used, without limitation, of the whole natural man.

Further, in his explanation of the "flesh," he declared that the body was not only the "seat and home of ὅσαλος," but identified with it sufficiently which answers the notion that the flesh may be entirely eradicated.\(^{164}\) With this, he gave seven other definitions which cover those aspects previously mentioned in this paper.

While it must be acknowledged that Scofield was a Bible scholar, one must be careful in following him in all his conclusions without personal research into the field. Scofield did not take into consideration the fact that Paul exhorted believers to cleanse themselves "from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit."\(^{165}\) The tense of the verb in this instance was the aorist imperative. The Apostle also said that "they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts." These Scriptures, plus

\(^{163}\) C. I. Scofield, Scofield Bible Correspondence Course (Chicago: Moody Press, 1907), p. 457.
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a full consideration of all the implications of the Pauline usages tend to show the limitation of Scofield's interpretation. However negative this presentation of Scofield's view of the "flesh" may seem, at other references he is very insistent upon the Christian obtaining victory through Christ. In spite of his view of the "flesh" he exhorted believers to be filled with the Spirit and it was for this reason that he was called an adherent to the Keswickian School.

Ruth Paxson (1876-1949). Ruth Paxson, a missionary to China, has presented in her best known volume, Life On The Highest Plane, the substance of lectures given to missionaries and workers on the field.

The basic approach to God's plan of redemption which was inherent in this writer was mildly Calvinistic. However, the distinctive feature of her approach was the unusually strong emphasis which she placed upon deliverance from sin and empowerment for service.

According to Miss Paxson, God appointed Adam the federal head of the whole race and thus, when Adam sinned, he became defiled and all his seed after him were infested with rebellion. His sin wrought havoc in all the universe to the extent that all things are distorted by sin. Although a strong emphasis was placed upon victory by Miss Paxson, she nevertheless identified sin, to some extent, with the human body, quoting Paul as her authority: "the
law of sin which is in my members.\footnote{166} According to her view the man who is spiritual still has two natures existing within him after he enters into a victorious life. With strong emphasis Miss Paxson sought to show that the spiritual man is habitually alive to God and dead to sin and to self. He is a bondservant to God and gladly, joyously, acknowledging the sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ.\footnote{167}

There were many strong features in the emphases which Miss Paxson made which when followed do lead to a spiritual life. But in laying a foundation for this spiritual life she based some of her thinking upon basic suppositions which make a complete deliverance from sin in this life impossible. In this connection probably the most basic error was the complete or partial identification of sin with the human body. According to the research previously presented this is not a correct identification. However, in Miss Paxson's description of the spiritual man, she stepped farther away from her basic supposition than logic would allow. To this writer it has seemed that Miss Paxson discovered the truly spiritual life in experience but in her identification of the "flesh" with the human body she has been influenced by a Calvinistic premise.

\footnote{166}{Romans 7:23.}
\footnote{167}{Ruth Paxson, \textit{Life on the Highest Plane} (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1928), pp. 18, 62f.}
Jessie Penn-Lewis (1861-1927). Jessie Penn-Lewis had a very clear conversion at an early age, but when she went out to work for the Lord she began to realize that she had a deep need for power in her Bible classes, her personal testimony, and her service to God. Through the guidance of a Spirit-filled minister she experienced a marvelous filling with the Holy Spirit. She felt herself divinely led to Russia, Finland, and to India for ministry as well as in the British Isles. In the early days of her service she was closely associated with the Keswick Movement but because of limitations placed upon her because of her sex she began an "overcomer movement" apart from the Keswick Convention.

The theology of Mrs. Penn-Lewis was built upon the two federal headships, Adam's and Christ's, and the development of her whole doctrine was dependent upon the organic relation one has to either of these two heads. "Flesh" for Mrs. Penn-Lewis was all that men have inherited from the first head, Adam, tainted with sin and selfish rebellion. But she held that man's evil nature has already been put to death on the cross of Christ. From God's standpoint man's evil nature was crucified with Christ at Calvary. However, each believer's part is to accept this death with Christ as his own, to reckon upon it, to account it finished. According to Mrs. Penn-Lewis the believer is to reckon himself dead, not dying, to sin. This death to sin is instantaneous in
respect to reckoning but progressive with regard to application. This progressive application is that which makes one conformable to the death of Christ. 168

With this presentation of her view before the reader it seemed wise to present the more intricate description which Mrs. Penn-Lewis gave to the "flesh." Not only is every person born in sin and a possessor of an Adamic nature but this nature was represented as constantly antagonistic to the Spirit. The "flesh" was characterized by Mrs. Penn-Lewis as being at enmity with God, as contrary to God, as minding earthly things, as ending in death. Not only these characteristics of the "flesh" were presented but some of the more subtle works of the "flesh" were pointed out: judging after the flesh, purposing after the flesh, glorying after the flesh, loving a fair show in the flesh, fighting for God after the flesh, friendships in the flesh, knowing Christ after the flesh. For each of these characteristics verses of Scripture were given for authority.

This investigator judged that Mrs. Penn-Lewis had a clear Scriptural conception of the "flesh" but possibly weak in an identification of the "flesh" with human nature. Further, "flesh" was never considered as neutral but filled with the moral.


Lewis Sperry Chafer (1871-1951). Lewis Sperry Chafer was the founder and first president of Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, Texas. This school was interdenominational but has had a strongly Calvinistic influence throughout. At this school Chafer was professor of systematic theology. His most comprehensive writing was his Systematic Theology in eight volumes.

Mr. Chafer claimed that the word "flesh," a much discussed term, was synonymous with the word "body" in some instances; however, he was quick to add that the word "flesh" most often referred to the whole of the unregenerate man, spirit, soul, and body. In this latter significance it assumes an ethical and psychological meaning which does not inhere in the word "body." Whereas body has reference to that physical part of the man whether living or dead, "flesh" expresses that unseen entity which animates the body.

This animating principle is that fallen nature which men have received from Adam and remains unchanged in the life of every believer and thus becomes one of the three great enemies of the spiritual life. This fallen nature of Adam, according to Chafer, is to be identified with the "old man" and indwelling sin. For him there was no biblical ground for

---

distinguishing between the Adamic nature and human nature inasmuch as they are one and the same thing.\textsuperscript{171}

This noted scholar failed to distinguish between what is human and what is sinful. To say that there is no distinction between human nature and Adamic nature is to say that Adam was in rebellion against God when God created him and thus when God made humanity he made it sinful. But the testimony of God was that man as originally created was "very good." Further, if human nature and the Adamic nature are one and the same then Christ was not the sinless Saviour since he had a human nature. It is commonly agreed among orthodox Christians that Christ was human, and that it was not sinful for him to will,\textsuperscript{172} to hunger,\textsuperscript{173} to weep and to feel pain.\textsuperscript{174}

To this investigator, one of the grave mistakes theologians can make is to identify sinfulness with a legitimate human desire. To make sinful what is basically legitimate and natural is not humbling but rather it is defeating and discouraging.


\textsuperscript{172} John 17, Matthew 26.

\textsuperscript{173} Matthew 4.

\textsuperscript{174} John 11.
L. E. Maxwell (1895- ). L. E. Maxwell, the principal of Prairie Bible Institute, Three Hills, Alberta, Canada, has written two significant books: Born Crucified, and Crowded to Christ. These books, the embodiment of the Keswick approach, have expressed a note of victory which some have failed to note.

Maxwell has declared that "flesh" refers to the whole of human nature in its fallen condition. In support of this position he called attention to the wills, the desires, the mind, the wisdom, the purposes, the confidence, the filthiness, the workings, the warring and the glorying of the flesh. The "flesh" was identified with the I, the ego, and thus there is nothing good about it; the place for the "flesh" is on the cross of Calvary. By the approach of Maxwell there was presented an initial deliverance from the "flesh" which gave victory at the center of the redeemed being, but there is a constant warfare with the "flesh" ever being discovered in its more subtle workings. On the cross the whole of the foul nature of the "flesh" was crucified with the Lord Jesus Christ; now, the part of the believer is to reckon upon the work of Christ and let the Spirit of God make effectual what has already been wrought for us on the Cross. 175

Maxwell's view of the "flesh" has given far too limited an interpretation to that term; it has not taken into consideration the various uses of the term. Further, in this approach the whole ego is condemned as wrong and sinful without taking into consideration the fact that God made man a personality and gave him the right to express his own free will without being driven by a supra-human will. There has remained a disappointing failure to make a clear distinction between the natural which is lawful, and the natural which is inherited from Adam through the fall.

SUMMARY

What has been stated concerning those adherents to the Keswickian trend of thought may be summarized in three statements:

1. Most of the writers in the Keswick School were too limited in their definition of the term "flesh."

2. The adherents to the Keswick theology have usually built upon a Calvinistic presupposition of the inherent sinfulness of the "flesh." The writers in this movement were quick to identify "flesh" and the human body.

3. Most of the writers in this school of thought made the term "flesh" equivalent with the self or the ego.
John Wesley (1704-1791). John Wesley, a graduate of Oxford University, the honored founder of Methodism, was converted in 1738, and became the promoter of a fervent revival of Christianity in England which also spread to and flourished in America. Since Wesley left no formal treatise on systematic theology, most of his theology must be ascertained from his written sermons, his explanatory note upon the New Testament, and other preserved writings.

In his sermon on "Sin in Believers," Wesley gave his definition of original sin:

Original sin is the corruption of the nature of every man, whereby man is in his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth contrary to the spirit. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek ἄρης, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe, yet this lust hath of itself the nature of sin. 176

Wesley declared that even those who deny the existence of sin in those who have been regenerated, when they are hard pressed they will acknowledge that sin does remain in the flesh of a believer. 177 He went further to declare that

177 Ibid., p. 108.
the "flesh" was in opposition to the spirit:

The apostle here directly affirms that the flesh, evil nature, opposes the Spirit, even in believers; that even in the regenerate, there are two principles, 'contrary the one to the other.'

Wesley concluded that both unbeliever and believer have sin in their hearts but the difference between the two is that the latter does not yield to it, while the unbeliever does. Every believer then has two natures which the Apostle terms "flesh" and "spirit." Although "babes in Christ" they are exorted to watch against the world, the flesh, and the devil. Thus "flesh," the evil nature, still remaining, though subdued, wars against the Spirit. While sin is suspended for a time in the heart of the believer, it is not long until he once again feels the rising of sin and thus the "flesh" is lusting against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh. According to Wesley there is a progressive mortifying of the deeds of the body from the time of conversion, but then there comes that time when all sin is excluded from the heart and the believer is filled with perfect love which excludes all sin.

In Wesley's treatment of the term "flesh," it has been

---

178 Ibid., p. 109.
179 Ibid., pp. 115-116.
180 Ibid., pp. 385-386.
difficult to determine his exact usage of it in every instance. There were times when he seemed to identify it with "indwelling sin" and others with just the thought of evil nature. In his presentation he was explicit that all sin can be removed from the heart in this life by the filling of the heart with perfect love. Wesley made no mention of the amoral uses of the expression "flesh" but in most instances associated it with fallen or evil nature.

William Burt Pope (1822-1903). William Burt Pope studied theology at Richmond College, England, and later was both a Methodist pastor and professor of theology in Didsbury College, Manchester. Of his several published volumes, probably the most outstanding was his three volume work entitled, A Compendium of Christian Theology.

In Pope's theology "flesh" designated three things: flesh as opposed to the human spirit, as opposed to the Divine Spirit, as designating humanity in its weakness, vanity, decay, and death.181

As a result of sin both the human flesh and the human spirit have marks of weakness which they must bear till death. However, these marks are not in themselves the originators of sin but the results of sin's work among our members. To those who cite St. Paul to prove the sinfulness of the "flesh,

Pope said that "the indwelling evil cannot be the same as the tabernacle in which it dwells." Therefore, the body is the instrument of sin and not the seat or the origin of sin.

But also the "flesh" and the Divine Spirit are set in contrast. In this instance "flesh" includes all the person in his fallen condition. The carnal man is one in whom the fallen nature has complete control and holds the man under the sway of sin. The spiritual man, on the other hand, is one who is under the sway of the Holy Ghost, one who has experienced the sanctifying grace in his body, soul, and spirit, and is thus made sinless, and preserved blameless.

Finally, the flesh is that designation of mankind as subjected to vanity, weakness, decay, and death. All "flesh" is as grass, but this is the result and not the cause of human sin. Therefore, to redeem the "flesh" of sinful man and to place dignity thereon, the Lord came in the likeness of sinful "flesh" and for sin, thus placing his stamp of approval upon the "flesh" as a meet dwelling place for the human spirit.

In his definition of "flesh," Pope explicitly identified "flesh" with the "old man" or the sin which remains in the

182 Ibid., p. 27.
183 Ibid., p. 26f.
believer.\textsuperscript{184} In this identification he refuted those positions which claim that there is no deliverance from indwelling corruption in this life by showing that this nature is crucified with Christ and is kept dead by His power. Pope believed in the complete deliverance of the soul from sin in this life by the experience of the sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit. Of the Wesleyan writers thus far presented, Pope set forth the most comprehensive view of the "flesh." Nevertheless, Pope so minimized the power of the "flesh" that its awfulness is not seen through his description.

\textbf{Henry E. Brockett (1892-)}. Henry E. Brockett, a minister in England, has sought to answer the questions posed by H. A. Ironsides\textsuperscript{185} in his book, \textit{Holiness, the True and the False}. Brockett presented the Wesleyan position in a sincere, personal, and experiential manner. He has sought to sustain his thesis through the witness of Scripture and the testimony of his own experience.

According to Brockett "flesh" may be defined as "simply human nature in its fallen condition regarded as apart from divine grace."\textsuperscript{186} This fallen human nature, including spirit, soul, body, reason, affections, appetites, has a

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{184}Ibid., p. 396.
\item \textsuperscript{185}Ironsides was pastor of the Moody Memorial Church from 1930 until shortly before his death.
\item \textsuperscript{186}Henry E. Brockett, \textit{Scriptural Freedom from Sin} (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1941), p. 122.
\end{enumerate}
hateful intruder, the sin in the flesh, and it is this hidden enemy within human nature that produces the "works of the flesh" referred to in the Galatian Letter. According to this writer the Apostle did not make reference to "indwelling sin" in the Galatian Letter but rather referred to the work of indwelling sin in the fallen human nature. Paul, claimed he, spoke of the work of the "flesh" because the fruit of indwelling sin is manifested and worked out through the "flesh." 187

Since "flesh" had no moral connotation for Brockett, but rather was equated with fallen human nature there is no deliverance from this in this life. Nor would there, according to Brockett's position, be any necessity for such a deliverance since the "flesh" has not moral import. However, in the view of Brockett, there is an intruder in the "flesh" and this intruder is designated as indwelling sin. For Brockett this indwelling sin is altogether different from the "flesh" and can be destroyed by the working of the Spirit of God. 188 Brockett seems to contradict himself by urging the believer to crucify the "flesh" and to loathe it as an enemy since it is the tabernacle of indwelling sin. 189

187 Ibid., p. 123.
188 Ibid., p. 125.
189 Ibid., p. 131.
The intention of Brockett was without doubt filled with deepest integrity. But however pure his motive, it seemed to this investigator that Brockett was somewhat too zealous to defend his own position. In the first place, he defined "flesh" in a much too limited context by equating it with fallen human nature apart from the divine influence. He failed to take into consideration Paul's use of "flesh" as a synonym, in some instances, for indwelling sin. In the reference made to the Galatian Letter Brockett did not adequately consider Paul's declaration that it is the "flesh" which lusts against the "Spirit." The greatest criticism which was made of Brockett's position was that he did not give room for all the Pauline usages of the term "flesh." It seemed to this investigator that in an effort to counteract the "two-nature theory," Brockett has settled for a position somewhat less than the whole Biblical presentation.

H. Orton Wiley (1877- ). H. Orton Wiley, a minister of the Church of the Nazarene, received his Doctor of Sacred Theology from the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California. He has served in many official capacities for his church.\textsuperscript{190} Undoubtedly his most outstanding contribution both to his church and to Wesleyan-Arminian thinkers has been

his three volume work, **Christian Theology**. Both in writing and in preaching Wiley has been a strong promoter of scriptural holiness as originally emphasized by John Wesley.

Wiley defined "flesh" as "the whole being of man, body, soul and spirit . . . separated from God and subjected to the creature."

This fallen human nature manifests itself in four basic patterns: idolatry, self as a ruling principle of life; the concupiscence of the flesh; and ungodliness. The loss of the Holy Spirit in the heart leaves the temple empty, and consequently false gods are worshipped in the place of the true and living God. With the whole being sold under sin the self is enthroned and worshipped in the place of God. With this self enthroned and still remaining essentially active there arises what is known as concupiscence or inordinate desire, that is, the self expresses itself without the control of the Spirit of God. Because of the potency of the self it is not static in its relationships but increases "unto more ungodliness." Wiley further defined "flesh," not as an active principle, but as the human being deprived of the Spirit of God and hence the depravation of its tendency.

---

192 Ibid., p. 94f.
193 Ibid., p. 100.
The implications of this position were that within the sphere of fallen human nature there is sin which is manifested in a self-separation from and a rebellion toward God. This bias or principle injects an alien element into the "flesh" and "spirit." Wiley pointed out that the Apostle urged believers to cleanse themselves from all filthiness of their "flesh" and spirit and to perfect holiness in the fear of God. Thus, they that are Christ's, in the full New Testament sense, have crucified the "flesh" with the affections and lusts. As Paul used the term, "flesh" implies that both the spiritual and the physical nature are under the reign of sin. According to Wiley there is deliverance from indwelling sin in this life but for a full deliverance from the marks of sin, the infirmities of the flesh, believers must await the resurrection and the glorification of the body. The fine demarcation between soul and body gives rise to difficulties in distinguishing between carnal acts and acts which are the results of infirmities. Wiley, it should be stated, exemplified a commendable insight into the nature of "flesh" and "sin." However, he, like many of the Wesleyan writers, did not specifically identify the "flesh" with indwelling sin. While he did point

194 Galatians 5:24.
out the evilness of the "flesh" and the sins into which it leads men, he failed to center his definition of the term on that foreign element in man's nature which is powerful, dynamic, and conquering when not fully dealt with by the Holy Spirit. This investigator has appreciated Wiley's explanation of infirmities as being the passive result of indwelling sin. Thus, infirmities are not active agents but passive marks which in this life shall always hamper, hinder, and humble the saintliest of all believers.

George Allen Turner (1908- ). George Allen Turner, a graduate of Harvard Divinity School, has been appointed head of the English Bible Department at Asbury Theological Seminary. His most scholarly work, The More Excellent Way, has set forth an inductive study of the concept of holiness in both the Old and the New Testaments.

In defining "flesh" Turner recognized that Paul's usage varied in different contexts. The "flesh" is sometimes equivalent to the body, but when the term was used in contrast to the Spirit, Turner has stated, it is quite generally recognized as having an ethical sense. The "flesh" as contrasted with the mind and the Spirit is commonly recognized as the enemy of both. By way of summary, Turner affirmed that the Pauline usage may be summarized as including a physical meaning; a semi-ethical, in which the flesh as the seat of evil impulses is treated as an anti-spiritual power;
and an ethical sense of unregenerate human nature.196

The implication of Turner's position is that sin as a principle is not identified with the body and thus the way is open for a full deliverance from sin in this life. Turner concluded that Paul taught that sin is not suppressed but destroyed by the experience of entire sanctification.197

It was obvious that Turner gave "flesh" an ethical import but to this investigator it was not clear whether or not Turner identified the "flesh" with indwelling sin. This investigator has come to view the distinction between the ethical and semi-ethical usage of the term "flesh" as one which must be made. In this context the idea of the passive effect of sin could well be placed.

SUMMARY

In a summary of the teaching of the Wesleyan writers in this survey, these facts have seemed to be representative:

1. Among the Wesleyan writers there has been lacking a concise treatment of the nature of "flesh" and the extent to which it defiles the personality of a man.

2. The Wesleyan thinkers surveyed did teach a definite deliverance from the power and pollution of the "flesh" in this

197 Ibid., pp. 79-80.
life.

3. With some Wesleyan writers there was a hesitancy to identify "flesh" with indwelling sin.

4. Some of the scholars in this tradition failed to grasp the meaning of "flesh" in its ethical sense, thereby missing the depth of its sinfulness and antagonism toward God.

5. By one Wesleyan writer, Wiley, a good portrayal was made concerning the enthroned self in the life of the fallen human nature of man.

6. One Wesleyan writer, Turner, interpreting "flesh" as an anti-spiritual force, gave expression to one phase of its meaning which has been for the most part overlooked by other writers.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

I. DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF THE STUDY

The exegetical approach used in the study has not previously been used in exactly the same way. In no other study known to this investigator has the author examined every instance in which Paul used the term "flesh" in the way this investigator has sought to do.

A careful examination has not heretofore been given to the implications set forth by the three schools of theology considered in this study. This paper has explicated the meaning of "flesh" as interpreted by opposing schools of thought which have majored on the spiritual emphasis involved.

The method employed in this study was inductive. By means of this method objectivity and authenticity have been criteria for guidance throughout the study. Without the employment of this method the investigator would likely have fallen into some of the well-beaten paths of influential theologians.

II. SUMMARY

In the survey of secular Greek and the usage of the term "flesh" in the Old Testament it was seen in Chapter One
that the most basic meaning of the term "flesh" has reference to those muscular portions of the body which surround the bones. This meaning was easily expanded to mean the person as a whole and finally to mean the whole human race. But neither in the secular Greek nor in the Old Testament was the term used to signify a moral nature.

In the non-Pauline sections of the New Testament it was shown that most of the writers based their idea of "flesh" upon the usage in the Old Testament. But the Apostle Peter and the Apostle John gave indication of using "flesh" to denote an ethical or moral quality of fallen man. Other writers in the New Testament used the concept to represent man in his sinfulness and fallen condition but none of them equated "flesh" with the principle of sin.

The investigation of the Pauline Epistles showed that Paul also used the term in all the shades of meaning given to it by the Old and New Testament writers. However, it was pointed out that his distinctive usage was the equating of "flesh" with indwelling sin and the "old man." It was demonstrated also that Paul did not use "flesh" as equivalent to sin when referring to the body.

A survey of the theological usage in the Calvinistic and Arminian traditions revealed the need for a more objective study of the problem. Preconceived ideas have led many thinkers to prejudiced and unwarranted conclusions which
were not tenable in the light of an inductive study of the Bible. In this theological survey it was found that the Wesleyan interpretation was closest to that teaching of the New Testament, but even among Wesleyan writers there was evidenced a need for a more detailed study of and more objectivity in approach to the subject.

III. CONCLUSIONS

After having studied the term "flesh" in its Scriptural and theological usages some conclusions have become inescapable for this investigator. It has become a conviction with this investigator that an honest effort should be made by members of those schools of thought presented in this study to rethink their position concerning Paul's use of the term "flesh."

1. No ethical import was given to the term during the secular period of the Greek language.

2. While in the Old Testament "flesh" was spoken of as weak in contrast with the omnipotence of God, it was never referred to as evil in itself.

3. The non-Pauline writers of the New Testament expanded the Old Testament concept of "flesh" in at least three ways: (a) to mean the creaturely side of life, (b) to denote the product of natural generation apart from God's Spirit, (c) to designate that principle in man's nature opposed to good and in rebellion toward God.
4. The usage of "flesh" to designate an indwelling principle of evil was used only by Peter in the non-Pauline sections of the New Testament.

5. Paul nowhere made the "flesh" an all compelling power; but rather showed that the believer is constantly faced with a choice either of overcoming by the Spirit or of being overcome by the flesh.

6. Paul did not identify sin with the body.

7. Paul did not identify "flesh" with sin in every instance of his usage of the expression.

8. Dickson gave the best analysis of the existing relationship between "flesh" and "sin" which this investigator has thus far discovered.

9. The evidence from the inductive study of the Pauline Epistles has substantiated the claims made in the second Chapter on General Usage.

10. In some contexts Paul identified "flesh" with indwelling sin.

11. "Flesh" as a motivating principle may be destroyed and the body of the person be preserved.

12. "Flesh" as a spiritual entity was not only represented as a bias toward evil but as having a mind, a will, desires, affections and also capable of union with another "flesh" and becoming one with it.

13. The designation of the natural made by Laidlaw
has a close affinity to Turner's designation of the semi-
ethical. This factor was considered important.

14. Paul represented deliverance as both instantaneous
and progressive. There was illustrated an instantaneous
experience of surrender followed by a progressive growth
and perfection of that spiritual life which was received.

15. The equation of finiteness with sin which has been
done by some leading Calvinists was basic to their view of
the "flesh."

16. It has become the opinion of this investigator
that George Allen Turner presented the best study of the
term "flesh" of any of the Wesleyan writers.

17. More study needs to be given to this subject by
theologians generally and especially by those holding the
Wesleyan point of view.

IV. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

This research and presentation has not been exhaustive
in its nature. Therefore the following suggestions for further
study have been listed for the interested student.

1. A more exhaustive study of the word "flesh" in
the secular Greek and in the Apocrypha would doubtless
prove both interesting and helpful.

2. A more exhaustive study from an historical
viewpoint would add light to that given in this paper.
3. An exegesis of each Pauline usage, set forth in its fullest context would add more light to the conclusions generally held than any other phase of research.

4. In the light of the Wesleyan doctrine of deliverance from all sin in this life, more attention needs to be given to the relationship of the "flesh" to human nature in the justified believer as well as in the fully sanctified Christian.

5. Since in some instances Paul seemed to equate "flesh" with the ego, a study of the psychological implications would prove both helpful and practical.

6. After having examined the theology of the various schools of thought giving attention to this Scriptural term, the study of biography and journals of those leading thinkers would give one a clearer idea of how their theology has worked out in practical Christian living.
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