

# **METAPHORICAL CONTINUITIES**

A Case for the Primacy of Corporate Indwelling

George J. Zemek

Director of Ministry Training  
The Bible Church of Little Rock  
19111 Cantrell Road  
Little Rock, AR 72223

## CONTENTS

ABREVIATIONS.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	4
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	
<b>SALIENT DATA FROM JOHN'S GOSPEL.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>John 7:39.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>John 14-16.....</b>	<b>6</b>
An Important Observation.....	7
The Importance of <i>ἄλλον παράκλητον</i> .....	7
The Verb Tenses and Prepositions of John 14:16-17.....	14
<b>John 20:22.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	
<b>SIGNIFICANT DATA FROM PAUL'S CORINTHIAN</b>	
<b>CORRESPONDENCE .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>1 Corinthians 12:13a.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>1 Corinthians 3:16.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>2 Corinthians 6:16.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>1 Corinthians 6:12-20 .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	
<b>SUPPORTING DATA FROM OTHER SOURCES .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Ephesians 2:20-22.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>1 Peter 2:4-5.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>SUMMARY-CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>ADDENDA.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>SINGULARS IN PLURAL SETTINGS .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<i>καρδία</i> .....	34
<i>σῶμα</i> .....	35
<i>ψυχή</i> .....	36
Anthropological <i>πνεῦμα</i> .....	37

## ABBREVIATIONS

<b>AB</b>	Anchor Bible
<b>HNTC</b>	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
<b>ICC</b>	The International Critical Commentary
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<b>JETS</b>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<b>JTS</b>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<b>LASNTG</b>	B. M. Metzger, <i>Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek</i> ; Princeton, 1971
<b>LXX</b>	Septuagint
<b>MG</b>	<i>A Concordance to the Greek Testament</i> , ed. by Moulton and Geden
<b>MHT</b>	<i>A Grammar of NT Greek</i> , Moulton, Howard and Turner
<b>NASB</b>	The New American Standard Bible
<b>NCBC</b>	New Century Bible Commentary
<b>NICNT</b>	The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Eerdmans
<b>NIDNTT</b>	<i>The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> , Zondervan
<b>NIGTC</b>	The New International Greek Testament Commentary; Eerdmans
<b>NIV</b>	New International Version
<b>NTS</b>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<b>TDNT</b>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> ; Eerdmans
<b>TNTC</b>	Tyndale New Testament Commentary
<b>UBS 4</b>	<i>The Greek New Testament</i> , 4th edition; ed. B. Aland; K. Aland; J Karavidopoulos; C. M. Martini; B. M. Metzger; UBS 1993
<b>WBC</b>	Word Biblical Commentary
<b>WP</b>	A. T. Robertson, <i>Word Pictures in the New Testament</i> , 6 vols.; Broadman

## INTRODUCTION

Among the many understatements which we periodically encounter in theological writings, the following one by Owen is a classic from the area of Pneumatology: “The inhabitation of the Spirit in believers is among those things which we ought, as to the nature or being of it, firmly to believe, but as to the manner of it cannot fully conceive.”<sup>1</sup> Part of the challenge is that due to the nature of Pneumatology, we encounter a higher percentage of metaphors in the New Testament’s revelations of the various doctrines pertaining to the Person and work of the Holy Spirit. That percentage seems to be even higher in connection with the scriptural data relating to indwelling. Lenski’s observation about this particular doctrine serves well as a hermeneutical benchmark: “This indwelling ... is mentioned throughout the Scriptures and is expressed in a variety of figures.”<sup>2</sup> Indeed identical, similar and overlapping metaphors for indwelling abound.

Unfortunately, our cultural influences often impede hermeneutical inductivity in this vital area of interpretation and theology. We in the West, for example, tend to view things from the perspective of the individual rather than that of the corporate community. Yet, the word-pictures employed to convey the indwelling of the Spirit focus first and foremost on His relationship with the community. When passages are recast to fit into a westernized mold, precious pneumatological - *corporately ecclesiological* teachings are turned into pneumatological - *individualistically anthropological* proof texts.

This tendency to shift the focus away from the community and on to the individual may be noted in a common way 1 Corinthians 6:19 is processed. Walvoord’s generalizations are exemplary:

The presence of the Holy Spirit makes the body of the believer a temple of God (1 Cor. 6:19)... The blessed fact that God has made the earthly bodies of Christians His present temple renders to life and service a power and significance which is at the heart of all Christian experience.<sup>3</sup>

Not only do such conclusions overlook the corporate continuities of these *metaphors* of divine presence, but they also often *equate* indwelling with other *ministries* of the Holy Spirit. But the *fact* of divine residence, although related to, is not identical to the *functions* of divine enablement. The biblical pictures of indwelling convey the concepts of position and relationship, but not innately and directly, the concept of empowerment.

---

<sup>1</sup> John Owen, *The Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1974), 795.

<sup>2</sup> R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1936), 510.

<sup>3</sup> John F. Walvoord, *The Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1954), 156. Cf. Charles Caldwell Ryrie, *The Holy Spirit* (Chicago: Moody, 1965), 69; Rene Pache, *The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit*, trans. by J. D. Emerson (Chicago: Moody, 1954), 167; etc. Pache’s terse statement has nearly become standardized: “... each individual believer is a temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19)” (ibid). J.A. Draper dubs this a “‘God in a bottle’ kind of individualism,” saying correctively, “It is clear from the exegesis of these texts, that the image of the Temple of the Holy Spirit is essentially a community image” (“The Tip of an Ice-Berg: The Temple of the Holy Spirit,” *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*, 59 [June 1987]: 57, 64).

This paper, largely based on the metaphorical continuities revelationally employed to convey the truth of indwelling, will argue that it is a picture of the permanent presence of God in the Body of Christ. It is primarily a precious family portrait rather than a host of individual prints.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> As will be shown, the *importance* of the reality of indwelling for the individual is not denied. However, individual members of the Body enjoy and benefit from God's presence *as members of the Body of Christ in which the Holy Spirit dwells*. The individual stones of God's spiritual house are likewise blessed *as stones belonging to that holy edifice in which the Spirit has taken up residence*. The focus of such metaphors is corporate. Their significance relates primarily to the whole and secondarily to the parts, but only as individual parts *of that whole*.

## CHAPTER 1

### SALIENT DATA FROM JOHN'S GOSPEL

#### *John 7:39*

The difficult clause *οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα* has often been used presuppositionally to assert that there was no vital and abiding relationship between the Spirit and believers prior to Jesus' glorification. Indeed the textual variants well illustrate a long history of theological presuppositions concerning John's statement:

The passage in the gospel of John in which this paradoxical statement occurs has been the subject of much discussion, from the days of Origen until now. The textual history of the passage shows that from a very early date scribes found the logion perplexing and its arrangement obscure.<sup>5</sup>

Furthermore, lest an uninformed reader imagine that John meant that the Spirit was not in existence prior to Jesus' glorification, copyists introduced a variety of modifications: (1) "the (Holy) Spirit was not yet given (*δεδομένον*)," ... (2) "the Holy Spirit was not yet *upon them*." ... and (3) "not yet *came* the Holy Spirit."<sup>6</sup>

Although some would associate the statement with enablement<sup>7</sup> and others would make it basically a matter of degree,<sup>8</sup> it needs to be considered in the light of its relationship to other crucial passages in the gospel such as John 14:16-20, 16:7, 20:22, etc. Within this larger contextual framework John 7:39 best aligns with the new situation which would be initiated at Pentecost:

John, writing at the close of the century, inserts this comment and interpretation of the language of Jesus as an allusion to the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost (the promise of the Father).<sup>9</sup>

#### *John 14-16*

Much of the content of these discourses is devoted to the future ministry of the Spirit (primarily in relationship to the original disciples and secondarily to those who would believe

---

<sup>5</sup> S. H. Hooke, "The Spirit Was Not Yet," *NTS*, 9:4 (July, 1963), 372; for an adequate survey of these variants, see 372-73.

<sup>6</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on The Greek New Testament* (London and New York; United Bible Societies, 1971), 218.

<sup>7</sup> E.g., Brooke Foss Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text With Introduction and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 1:278. Notice Westcott's inordinate stress regarding anarthrous *πνεῦμα* herein, (*ibid.*, 279).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Merrill C. Tenney, *John: The Gospel of Belief* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1948), 135.

<sup>9</sup> A. T. Robertson, *WP* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930) 5:132.

through their word). Apart from one extended contextual observation, the data examination will be restricted for the most part to John 14:16-20.

### An Important Observation<sup>10</sup>

“Let not your heart be troubled” is an exhortation which to various degrees permeated all of Jesus’ remaining teachings concerning the ministries of the Holy Spirit. This observation is particularly applicable to the great disclosures recorded in John 14:

After the opening dramatic scene, comprising action and dialogue, we come to the first cycle of discourse, which is in dialogue form, extending from xiii.31 to xiv.31. Ch. xiv is clamped together by the repeated use of the expression *μὴ ταρασέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία* in verses 1 and 27. Ch. xiv is linked with what precedes by the recurrence of the theme of Christ’s departure (xiii.33, xiv.2, 4, etc.). The whole dialogue, indeed is dominated by the ideas of going and coming.<sup>11</sup>

Within this love matrix but in the presence of a demonstrated lack of understanding, lack of acceptance (i.e. of the facts), and anxiety on the part of the disciples, Jesus progressively revealed ἄλλον παράκλητον (Jn 14:16). He painstakingly communicated in various ways the imminent economic change in their personal relationship with God.

#### The Importance of ἄλλον παράκλητον

The word *παράκλητος* is restricted to the Johannine corpus (i.e. 5 occurrences: Jn 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7; 1 Jn. 2:1).<sup>12</sup> Braumann condenses some etymological observations into the following statement:

*Paraklētos* is a cognate of the vb. *Parakaleō*, the meanings of which in cl. Gk. range from call in, send for, summon, to exhort, encourage, comfort, console. The noun *paraklētos* is derived from the verbal adj. and means called [to one’s aid]. It is first found in a legal context in the court of justice, meaning legal assistant, advocate.<sup>13</sup>

Etymologically, there is not much contention in reference to the significance of the

---

<sup>10</sup> This contextual key may go even beyond John 14-16. It could well help to illuminate the seemingly enigmatic action of Jesus in John 20:22. The immediate contextual scope is appropriately labeled by Dodd as “Dialogue on Christ’s departure and return, xiii. 31—xiv. 31” (C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge: University Press, 1970], 403).

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. Cf. how Dodd applies this truth to John 14:12ff. However, note that he does this exclusively under the umbrella of realized eschatology (ibid, 405-06).

<sup>12</sup> See: Harry S. Benjamin, “Pneuma in John and Paul. A Comparative Study of the Term with Particular Reference to the Holy Spirit,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 6:1 (February, 1976), 33-34. For a survey of all of the various pneumatological designations in the New Testament, see: Ibid., 48.

<sup>13</sup> Georg Braumann, “*παράκλητος*” *NIDNTT*, 1:88.

compounded preposition *παρά*. For example, of *παρά* + *καλέω* (i.e. *παρακαλέω*), Metzger renders the literal significance “I call *to my side*” (italics added).<sup>14</sup> Applying this significance to John 14:16, Hendriksen suggests that “the Spirit is here called another Paraclete (*παράκλητος*). The term indicates that he is a person who is *called to the side* (in this case, of the disciples) *in order to help*.”<sup>15</sup>

When the etymological background of the *-κλητος* part of the word is investigated, great are the divergences in opinion. The complex problem is summarized simply by Braumann:

The etymology of *paraklētos* suggests that it was used originally in the passive sense of one called in to help. But the passages in which it occurs in the NT show that this is alien to its meaning there.<sup>16</sup>

Discussions concerning the background of the word are most profuse. A wide range of background sources have been proposed and defended;<sup>17</sup> however, only one of them demonstrates a consistent degree of credibility. This particular source is advocated by Davies.<sup>18</sup> The vital but somewhat tangential association of the noun *παράκλητος* with the Hebrew root  $\text{נחם}$  constitutes the heart of this view. Compare Brown’s summary of the leading evidence:

The verb *παρακληίν* occurs 138 times in the LXX; in 61 of the 78 times where it has a Hebrew equivalent, that equivalent is from the root  $\text{נחם}$ , “to console.” Admittedly *παράκλητος* itself is not used in the LXX, but the single occurrence in Aquila and in Theodotian (Job xvi.2) is as “consoler.”<sup>19</sup>

To this evidence is added the context of the four occurrences of *παράκλητος* in John’s Gospel. Consequently, Davies draws the following conclusions:

As used by the fourth evangelist *παράκλητος* belongs to a complex of ideas from which it should not be separated if its meaning *in its context* is to be correctly determined.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *LASNTG* (Princeton: Bruce Metzger, 1971), 84.

<sup>15</sup> William Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1953), 2:276.

<sup>16</sup> *NIDNTT*, 1:89.

<sup>17</sup> For an outlined summary, see Raymond E. Brown, “The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS*, 13:2 (January 1967), 116-19.

<sup>18</sup> J. G. Davies, “The Primary Meaning of *ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ*” *JTS*, New Series, 4 (April 1953), 35-38. Cf. Barrett’s adequate summary of this position: C. K. Barrett, “The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel,” *JTS*, New Series, 1:1 (April, 1950), 13. Note especially the many examples of parallelism to the Hebrew root  $\text{נחם}$ .

<sup>19</sup> Brown, “The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” 117-18, n. 5. For a complete survey of the evidence, see: Davies, “The Primary Meaning of *ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ*,” 37-38.

<sup>20</sup> Davies, “The Primary Meaning of *ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ*,” 36.

We may conclude therefore that, despite its passive form, *παράκλητος*, set by the author of the fourth gospel in the same complex [i.e. LXX background data], has assumed an active significance and that its primary meaning is “comforter.”<sup>21</sup>

On the other end of the spectrum relating to the significance of *παράκλητος* in the Gospel of John, stand many who have allowed their etymological presuppositions to calcify their contextual sensitivities.<sup>22</sup> In light of the problems encountered (on both sides) when any one *translation* of *παράκλητος* is utilized consistently in John’s Gospel, Brown’s survey of usage and conclusion is worthy of our consideration:

In summation, the concept of the Paraclete, like love, is a many-splendoured thing: the Paraclete is a *witness* in defense of Jesus and a *spokesman* for him in the context of the trial of Jesus by his enemies; the Paraclete is a *counselor* of the disciples; more important, he is their teacher, and guide and thus, in an extended sense, their *helper*. No translation captures the complexity of these functions.... We would probably be wise to...settle for “Paraclete,” a near transliteration that at least preserves the uniqueness of the title and does not emphasize one of the aspects of the concept to the detriment of others.<sup>23</sup>

Hendriksen helps to bring the whole digression back into perspective with his twofold summary of the facts:

(1) The fact that by derivation the word is a verbal adjective derived from

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 38. Davies’ conclusions are essentially credible; however, it is suggested that the word “meaning” in his last assertion be changed to “association.” For this reason, Barrett’s skeptical evaluation of all the proposed background studies of *παράκλητος* is not totally unjustified: “It seems, then, that in spite of the labours of scholars the background of John’s thought about the Paraclete-Spirit has not yet been satisfactorily illuminated, nor has the source of his language been made clear” (C. K. Barrett, “The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel,” 12).

<sup>22</sup> All of these refuse to relinquish totally the passive sense of the word when they come to the data in the Gospel of John. Due to this fact, they develop intricate circumlocutions in order to avoid the clear implications of an active sense in that Gospel. Behm is an excellent example. Notice a few of his understatements and overstatements. He first appeals to the pre-New Testament evidence wherein the word has the sense of “a legal adviser or helper or advocate in the relevant court” (*TDNT*, 803). He also notes (but from the wrong vantage point) that the occurrences of the word in John’s Gospel do not “fit smoothly into the history of the word” (803). Also, he sheepishly concedes: “Nor is the legal metaphor adhered to strictly. What is said about the sending, activity and nature of this paraclete (16:7,13-15; 15:2,6; 14:16f., 26) belongs to a very different sphere, and here... *παράκλητος* seems to have the broad and general sense of “helper” (803-04). However, he does not hesitate to criticize a meaning which (like the others) does not reflect the individual usage nuances, but does reflect the contextual tone of the whole passage: “The only thing one can say for certain is that the sense of ‘comforter,’ favored by e.g., Wycliffe, Luther, and the A.V. in John’s Gospel, does not fit any of the NT passages” (804).

<sup>23</sup> Raymond E. Brown, “The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” 118-119. For an expanded treatment of the data, see his “Appendix V: The Paraclete” in: Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1970), 2:1135-1144... For additional surveys of the *functions* of the *παράκλητος* in the Gospel of John, see: Behm, *TDNT*, 5:813.

the passive (perfect) form of the verb παρακλέω must not be interpreted to mean that therefore the resulting word *remains forever passive in meaning*. The *derivation* of words is one thing; the *history of their meaning in actual usage* (to which the science of semantics devotes its attention) is a different matter. To be sure, there is a relation between the two, but they are by no means the same. The context must decide. In John it is the active idea that is stressed, as every reference to him indicates (see next paragraph). The Paraclete *does* certain things for the disciples (and, of course, for the Church).

(2) The meaning of the word must not be too narrowly restricted. The Holy Spirit is a Helper in ever so many respects: he *comforts*, indeed, and since the main theme of chapter 14 is *comfort* it is possible that Jesus had this in mind more than anything else. But the Spirit also (and in close connection with the work of imparting comfort) teaches, guides in truth (16:13, 14); brings the teaching of Christ home to the recollection of the disciples (14:26); and dwells within them as a source of inspiration and life (14:17). The Father and the Son call the Spirit to the side of the disciples in order to comfort, admonish, teach, and guide them; in other words, in order that in any given condition the Paraclete may furnish *whatever help is necessary*.<sup>24</sup>

By the use of ἄλλος rather than ἕτερος, a potential implication is that the adjective conveys a quantitative differentiation and a qualitative continuity.<sup>25</sup> For example, Firor has argued that “the Divine Spirit is to us exactly what Jesus was to the apostles during his earthly ministry.”<sup>26</sup> The force of ἄλλος along with the connotation of παρά in composition (i.e. παράκλητος) should not be overlooked while examining the rest of the pneumatological data from John 14; just as (cf. ἄλλος) Jesus was alongside (cf. παρά) the disciples so would be the Holy Spirit in the Lord’s absence.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, 2:276.

<sup>25</sup> For specific application to John 14:16, see: J. N. Sanders and B. A. Mastin, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, HNTC (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1968), 327; Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, 2:275.

<sup>26</sup> Warfield M. Firor, “Fulfillment of Promise: The Holy Spirit and the Christian Life,” *Int*, 7:3 (July 1953), 302. Firor’s statement is basically accurate, but could be made more precise with two modifications: 1) the word “exactly” is vulnerable, and 2) the apostles also experienced this relationship after the ascension and Pentecost.

<sup>27</sup> Such a conception necessitates a spatial orientation; however, an *exclusively* spatial perspective in reference to the Spirit’s relationship to believers is prone to generate theological problems. Nevertheless, language stemming from a spatial benchmark is used in this very passage by Jesus to describe that relationship (e.g. Jn. 14:16-17; cf. the ensuing discussion of the key prepositions found therein). Whether or not the παρά of παράκλητος and the other prepositions *primarily* convey spatial emphases, they must not be denied their spatial roots. Therefore, it is possible that there is spatial imagery in Jesus’ choice of these words. For example, Lenski’s comments would become unintelligible without some spatial associations: “Jesus calls the Spirit ‘another Paraclete,’ implying that he himself was the first Paraclete of the disciples when he walked in their midst.... The Spirit, as the Paraclete, takes the place of Jesus *at the side of* [emphasis added] the disciples” (R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. John’s Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1943), 997, 998).

Syntactically, it is possible to take ἄλλον substantivally and παράκλητον appositionally,<sup>28</sup> but “another Paraclete’...is the more probable translation.”<sup>29</sup> The former suggestion has undoubtedly arisen as an expedient due to the following intricate problem.

The relationship of Christ and the Spirit transcends finite analyses.<sup>30</sup> It is seemingly paradoxical, as Westcott’s attendant remark concerning ἄλλον παράκλητον indicates: “He is ‘another,’ yet such that in His coming Christ too may be said to come (v. 18).”<sup>31</sup> Lenski is a little more reserved concerning an identity equivalence: “Jesus, indeed, does not identify himself with the Spirit so that the Spirit’s presence with the disciples is the presence of Jesus; but he does connect his coming with that of the Spirit.”<sup>32</sup> Malatesta gropes for words as he strives for more precision:

That Jesus “has come in and through the Paraclete” is in harmony with John’s teaching: to say that “as the Paraclete, Jesus is present within all believers” seems to be not in accord with John’s view. Jesus never identifies Himself in this way with the Paraclete; He never indicates that the Paraclete will take His place in such a way that He Himself will no longer really be present. The fact that the Spirit is “another” Paraclete, that His role parallels that of Jesus... should not lead us to believe that he *replaces* Jesus. Might we not better say that He is the “medium” through whom and in whom the glorified Jesus continues his work of revealer (17, 26)?<sup>33</sup>

Another statement by Lenski multiplies the complexity of this relationship by one more person:

They who dearly love Jesus and who now see him departing are not to be left orphans, shifting for themselves as best they can; they shall have a substitute for the familiar presence of Jesus, another Paraclete at their side; in fact, also the Father and Jesus will come and dwell with them in invisible presence.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> “The ἄλλον παράκλητον may also be rendered: ‘The Father will give *you another, a Paraclete,*’ thus removing any suggestion of a prior Paraclete” (Brown, “The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” 114, n. 1).

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> For a general survey, see “The Double Relation Between The Spirit and Christ” in Berkhof, *The Doctrine of The Holy Spirit*, 17-21. Based upon passages like Mt 28:20, Jn 14:18, 1 Jn 3:24, Rev 2:7, etc., he appropriately remarks, “That the Spirit is bound to Christ is far more true than is meant and expressed in classical Pneumatology” (ibid., 24).

<sup>31</sup> Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 2:176. Cf. Schweizer’s swim through the pertinent data in John (TDNT, 6:442-43).

<sup>32</sup> Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. John’s Gospel*, 1002. Cf. his whole argument relating to John 14:18, 21, 23 (ibid., 1001-02).

<sup>33</sup> Edward Malatesta, “The Spirit/Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” *Biblica*, 54:4 (1973), 550. It should be noted that both Malatesta’s and Lenski’s summaries fall within the scope of Biblical theology. They do not deal with Jesus’ revelations recorded in Mt. 18:20; 28:20; etc.

<sup>34</sup> Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. John’s Gospel*, 995-96.

So, "...Father, Son, and Spirit are with us as three who are one, as three who are present in the dynamic presence of the interpersonal life of God which is communicated to us and into which we are drawn."<sup>35</sup>

Consequently, "effects in the life of the believer are attributed indiscriminately to Christ and to the Spirit; but they are also attributed to God."<sup>36</sup> The following survey is helpful concerning John's data in reference to indwelling:

John's writings clearly affirm the indwelling presence of God in the disciples (1 Jn. 4, 12, 13, 15, 16), of Jesus (6, 56; 14, 20; 15:5; 17, 23, 26; 1 Jn. 3, 24), of the Father and Jesus together (14, 23), of the Paraclete (14, 17). It is noteworthy that there is only one text which mentions explicitly the "abiding with" and "being in" of the Paraclete. Obviously other texts imply this presence, but the stress is clearly on the presence of the Father and the Son. One might say that the Father and the Son dwell in us through and with the Paraclete/Spirit, but to speak of the presence of God only in terms of the Paraclete/Spirit seems unduly restrictive and not sufficiently explicit.<sup>37</sup>

Only two verses can be briefly surveyed for exegetical corroborations.

In John 14:18, after speaking of *ἄλλον παράκλητον*, Jesus says, "I am coming to you." Three views of this coming are generally encountered: 1) it refers to Jesus' post-resurrection appearances,<sup>38</sup> 2) it refers to Jesus' coming in the Person of the Holy Spirit,<sup>39</sup> and 3) it is an eschatological reference to the second coming. Although the immediate context would tend to support the second view, Wescott's hybrid interpretation is noteworthy: "*I come*.... The Fulfillment of the promise began at the Resurrection, when Christ's humanity was glorified; and the promise was potentially completed at Pentecost.... No one specific application of the phrase exhausts its meaning."<sup>40</sup>

John 14:23 is closely related. In this verse, Christ "and his Father *will make their home with them*; home is literally, 'place to stay in,' used in the plural in xiv.2."<sup>41</sup> Exegetically, there is not as much room for options (cf. v. 18 above):

---

<sup>35</sup> Malatesta, "The Spirit/Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," 548.

<sup>36</sup> Ernest Best, *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: SPCK, 1955), 11. For his argument, see: *ibid.*, 10-11.

<sup>37</sup> Malatesta, "The Spirit / Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," 547.

<sup>38</sup> Tenny, *John: The Gospel of Belief*, 220-21. In the light of the *immediate* context, however, this view is inadequate.

<sup>39</sup> "The Lord departs, and yet comes; and the solution of that variety of statement is by no means difficult; for He comes in the power of His Spirit" (George Smeaton, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* [Carlisle, PA, Banner of Truth, 1974], 260). An excellent outlined presentation and defense of the view is given by Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, 2:279-80. Certainly in the light of the immediate context, this view represents at least the primary intention of Jesus' assertion.

<sup>40</sup> Wescott, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:178.

<sup>41</sup> Sanders and Mastin, *A Commentary on The Gospel according to St. John*, 332.

πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα. The plural alone...is sufficient to show that John has in mind neither the resurrection appearances nor the *parousia* of the last day.... It is the interval...between the resurrection and the consummation that he proposes to explain. The explanation is in the terms of the “mystical” abiding of God with the believer.<sup>42</sup>

Consequently, this “coming” answers primarily to Pentecost.<sup>43</sup>

These intricate and intimate relationships result in a reciprocal union.<sup>44</sup> It is obvious that John’s Gospel and epistles reveal both the ideas of “Deity In Believers”<sup>45</sup> and “Believers In Deity.”<sup>46</sup> These realities also have a significant bearing upon this present study. Although it is comparatively easy to delineate what mutual indwelling is not,<sup>47</sup> its nature and intricacies challenge all finite investigations.<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless, the following excerpts from Dodd’s study deserve close scrutiny:

It is clear that for the evangelist...the idea, *ἐν θεῷ* with its correlative, “God in us,” stands for the most intimate union conceivable between God and man. But it clearly does not mean for him...an impersonal inclusion, or absorption, into the divine, conceived pantheistically; nor does it mean...an ecstatic possession by a divine afflatus. It is so far like the former that it involves a real community of being, a sharing of life; and it is so far like the latter that it is a dynamic relation and not a static, producing the effects of an incursion of divine energy through which men may speak the words and do the works of God. But it is unlike both in being a personal relation with a living God, mediated through a concrete, historical personality, in whom that relation is original and perfect. It is not a question of inhering as it were adjectivally in the absolute Substance.<sup>49</sup>

He [i.e. John] makes use of the strongest expressions for union with God that contemporary religious language provided, in order to assure his readers that he does seriously mean what he says: that through faith in Christ we may enter into a personal community of life with the eternal

---

<sup>42</sup> Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 466. It should be pointed out that the evidence of this verse becomes part of the immediate context which aids in interpreting verse 18.

<sup>43</sup> Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, 2:284.

<sup>44</sup> For peripheral support, see: Lindars’ consecutive headings of “The Promise of the Counsellor” (Jn 14:15-17) and “Mutual Indwelling” (Jn 14:18-24): Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, NCBC, 477-480; and Dodd’s “obviously intentional parallelism between expressions used regarding the mutual indwelling, and the mutual knowledge, of God (Christ) and men” (Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 187). He properly speaks of “unity by mutual indwelling” (ibid, 196).

<sup>45</sup> Ardel B. Canedy, “Reciprocal Vital Union and the Perseverance of the Saints in Johannine Literature” (unpublished postgraduate seminar paper, Grace Theological Seminary, March 17, 1977), 9-11.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid, lfff.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 197.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 197-200.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 197.

God, which has the character of ἀγάπη, which is essentially supernatural and not of this world, and yet plants its feet firmly in this world, not only because real ἀγάπη cannot but express itself in practical conduct, but also because the crucial act of ἀγάπη was actually performed in history, on an April day about A.D. 30.<sup>50</sup>

### The Verb Tenses and Prepositions of John 14:16-17

In conjunction with a difficult textual variant in verse 17,<sup>51</sup> this data is used in a variety of combinations to argue for divergent positions in reference to the doctrine of indwelling.

#### The Tenses Considered

That John 14:16-17a has a futuristic orientation is obvious (cf. ἐρωτήσω ... δώσει ἵνα<sup>52</sup> ... ἧ ... ὁ...). However, the middle portion of verse 17 is not so obvious concerning time orientation. The verb γινώσκετε is present, and it is most probable that μένει is to be preferred over μενεῖ. The last verb in verse 17 is problematic due to a major textual variant (cf. note 51); however, strong textual support would suggest that the future form (i.e. ἔσται) is probably the correct reading. If this is the correct pattern, how is ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε αὐτὸ, ὅτι παρ' ὑμῶν μένει to be construed?

Many argue that the present tense (or tenses, if one accepts ἔστιν as the reading of the last verb) is “being used proleptically of the future.”<sup>53</sup> Hendriksen, who does not sharply differentiate the prepositions of John 14:16-17 (cf. the ensuing discussion) and who accepts the future reading of ἔσται in verse 17, tries to maintain the continuity of his argument by taking γινώσκετε and μένει proleptically.<sup>54</sup> Although his continuity of argumentation is appealing, he does not address himself to the awkward situation of construing the *middle* two verbs proleptically while clear futuristic indications are evident before and *after* them.

In the light of the above and other suggestions concerning the verb tenses in John

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 199-200.

<sup>51</sup> Note the textual data in the second and third editions of the UBS Greek Testament and also the fact that the second edition supported the reading ἔστιν but the third edition supported ἔσται while giving to it the same D rating. The fourth edition elevates this reading to a C rating. Metzger comments as follows: “A majority of the Committee interpreted the sense of the passage as requiring the future ἔσται, which is adequately supported...” (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 245). For an extended survey of the variants, see: Wes Teterud, “The Abiding Spirit” (unpublished Master of Divinity Thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, May 1978), 5-15.

<sup>52</sup> It is generally agreed that the ἵνα is telic and the clause is obviously potential.

<sup>53</sup> J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, ICC, 2:546.

<sup>54</sup> Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, 2:278 Consequently, all the verbs realize their fulfillment on the day of Pentecost (ibid., 278-79).

14:16-17, Teterud's assertion is in actuality an understatement: "...a dogmatic position based on the tenses of the verbs cannot be taken in regard to a temporary indwelling versus a permanent indwelling."<sup>55</sup>

### The Prepositions Considered

Intertwined with the above complexities is the matter of the prepositions *μετά*, *παρά*, and *ἐν* in the same context. Many try to draw strong lines of contrast between each of them: "The first [i.e. *μετά*] marks the relation of fellowship: comp. xiv.9, xv.27. The second [i.e. *παρά*] that of a personal presence: comp. viii.38, xiv.23, 25, xvii.5. The third [i.e. *ἐν*] that of individual indwelling: comp. xiv. 10f."<sup>56</sup> However, a study of these prepositions validates Kent's parenthetic warning:

The interpreter must beware, however, of downgrading the relationship of the Spirit to men expressed by "with you" (*par' humin*), and suppose that this relation would be replaced by that of being "in you" (*en humin*). It must be noted that the same preposition "with" (*para*) is used to describe the present relation of the Father and the Son to believers when the Holy Spirit comes upon them (14:23). One must avoid making too sharp a distinction between these prepositions, and at the same time not minimize the importance of Pentecost.<sup>57</sup>

"As a pre. with the gen. *μετά* means basically 'among,' 'in the midst.'"<sup>58</sup> Adkinson's brief survey is helpful:

---

<sup>55</sup> Teterud, "The Abiding Spirit," 2. As a point of clarification, it must not be assumed that this work supports Teterud's line of argumentation *plenarily* (cf. the developing argumentation below).

<sup>56</sup> Wescott, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2:176-77. Subsequently, he does make some minor concessions; for example, "For in Christ the Spirit was truly present already, if not in His characteristic manifestation; just as Christ is present now with His Church in the Spirit..." (ibid., 177-78). Most of the statements or portions thereof demonstrate theological presuppositions tailored to a traditional concept of indwelling. Cf. Bernard's assertion: "First it is said that the Spirit of Truth abides *μετὰ ὑμῶν*, then *παρ' ὑμῶν* and finally *ἐν ὑμῶν*, the last phrase signifying the indwelling of the Spirit in the individual disciple (Rom. 8:9, 1 Jn. 2:27, 2 Jn. 2), while the other phrases (*the former of which occurs also in 2 Jn. 2*) [emphasis added] lay emphasis on the fellowship of the Spirit with the disciples collectively, that is, with the Church" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, 2:546). First, there is absolutely no need to take *ἐν* distributively, because "with the plural nouns *ἐν* may have the resultant idea of 'among'..." (A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* [Nashville: Broadman, 1934], 587). Second, a detailed study of the prepositions does not support drawing sharp lines of contrast between these words (cf. ensuing survey).

<sup>57</sup> Kent's statement demonstrates excellent balance. Homer A. Kent, Jr., *Light in the Darkness: Studies in the Gospel of John* (Winona Lake: BMH, 1974), 175, n. 12. For a mediating position concerning these prepositions, see: Wood, *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament*, 86. To this observation must also be added the strength of *μένω*; *μένει* clearly indicates "that the Holy Spirit was already abiding in a very intimate way with the disciples" (Teterud, "The Abiding Spirit," 60).

<sup>58</sup> Walter Grundmann, *σύν* - *μετά* with Genitive, *κτλ.*, *TDNT*, 7:771. The material under heading D is worth surveying: "*σύν* and *μετά* in statements about Being Together of God and Man" (ibid., 773-81).

*Μετά* when followed by the genitive has the overriding sense of association and various shades of meaning which are close to each other and sometimes overlap. In its concrete sense it expresses contact of immediate association.<sup>59</sup>

Harris briefly surveys the usage of *παρά* as follows:

This is one of two NT preps, (the other is *ἐπι*) regularly used with three cases. If its radical signification is “by the side of,” “beside,” *para* with the acc. (60 times in the NT) designates movement “to a position beside” (Mk. 4:4; Acts 4:35; but cf. Mk. 4:1; 10:46 where no idea of movement is implied); with the gen. (78 times), movement or procession “from beside” (Jn. 1:6; but note Lk. 6:19, where *para* follows a vb. compounded with *ἐκ* [ex]); with the dat. (50 times), rest or position “beside” (Lk. 9:47; Js. 8:38; 19:25, the latter being the only NT use with a thing, not a person.).<sup>60</sup>

Atkinson adds the personal application concerning *παρά* in John: “The most simple and the most profound are brought together in a sacred relationship. Nothing could better illustrate the simplicity of our relationship with God nor the Divine condescension.”<sup>61</sup> Hauck provides an excellent transitional statement to the next preposition when he notes the fact that “*παρά* has much the same meaning as *ἐν*, as v. 17 shows.”<sup>62</sup>

The last preposition (i.e. *ἐν*) is by far the most difficult to interpret. This is true because of two crucial facts. The first fact is statistical, since it involves the great frequency of *ἐν*: “This is the most popular prep, in the NT.”<sup>63</sup> The second fact involves the complications of its great scope of usage: “A corollary of the versatility of *ἐν* is the exegetical ambiguity that often attaches to its use.”<sup>64</sup>

Theologically, *ἐν* of all the prepositions<sup>65</sup> demonstrates probably the widest spectrum

---

<sup>59</sup> Basil F. C. Atkinson, “The Theology of Prepositions,” a lecture delivered on January 7, 1944 at a Conference of Graduate and Theological Student members of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship, held in Trinity College, Cambridge, 20. In addition (pertaining to a Divine association with men), he notes concerning the impact of Mt 1:23, etc. (i.e. God *with* us) that the “emphasis of the phrase is upon *help* which the presence and contact brings” (idid.).

<sup>60</sup> Murray J. Harris, “Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament,” *NIDNTT*, 3:1201.

<sup>61</sup> Atkinson, “The Theology of Prepositions,” 11.

<sup>62</sup> F. Hauck, “*μὲν*,” *TDNT*, 4:580, n. 4.

<sup>63</sup> Harris, *NIDNTT*, 3:1190.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 1191.

<sup>65</sup> For a good discussion of the phenomena relating to *all* these prepositions in reference to their extensions from the spatial to the conceptual, see: Atkinson, “The Theology of Prepositions,” 4.

of development from its spatial roots to its conceptual connotations:<sup>66</sup>

The preposition occurs in various senses, a simple local sense, temporal, instrumental, or expressive of a state (e.g. *Solomon in all his glory*). The supreme contribution of this preposition to New Testament religion is in the Pauline phrase *ἐν χριστῷ*. The meaning is rich and wide.... The local sense is not altogether absent, for we cannot exclude the conception of shelter or refuge from the condition which the phrase expresses. But the main idea denoted by these two words is, I imagine, an extension of the fourth sense, whereby the preposition becomes almost equivalent in meaning to the words “a part of.”... To be “in Christ” means to be in Him in the sense in which a man’s hand is in his body. In this simple sublime phrase there is hope and comfort for the sinner and power for the saint, there is the revelation of an inner spiritual life embracing but surpassing the Christian life in this world, and there is the expression of the unity of all believers with the implied denial of the possibility of spiritual isolation.<sup>67</sup>

It is evident that this little word can bear awesome conceptual weight while maintaining a point of contact with its local sense. This is exactly the situation in which we find it in John 14:17.

It has already been noticed that the context is permeated by spatial intimations and illustrations (cf. *παράκλητος*, v.15; *παρά*, v.16; *μετά*, v.17; *πρός*,<sup>68</sup> v.18; etc). No matter how much conceptual freight these prepositions bear, it must be recognized that Jesus is utilizing spatial relationships in order to communicate these great truths. It is on this level of analysis that some metaphorical deductions need to be made. Buswell, therefore, well translates *ἐν ὑμῖν* “among you” with the following explanation:

I have translated the last preposition in this passage “among” rather than “in.” It is the preposition *en* with the dative plural. Grammatically of course the prepositional phrase might be construed distributively, in you individually,” but the context indicates no such thought. He is to be “with you forever,” *meta humon*. You already “know him” because “he dwells with you,” *para humin*, and he is going to be among you or “in you as a

---

<sup>66</sup> For example, Oepke discusses “The *ἐν* of Fellowship in John,” noting: “Exclusively in John’s Gospel and 1 Jn. (some 15 + 12 times) we have a distinctive *ἐν* of religious fellowship.... The formulae are neither ecstatic nor eschatological...We might call them mystical in the broader sense” (Albrecht Oepke, “*ἐν*” *TDNT*, 2:543).

<sup>67</sup> Atkinson, “The Theology of Prepositions,” 21.

<sup>68</sup> Concerning *πρός* herein, “In its basic sense *pros* denotes actual motion or literal direction...but the developed sense of mental direction or tendency followed naturally, referring to relationships...” (Harris, *NIDNTT*, 3:1204).

company”, *en humin*.<sup>69</sup>

The importance of Buswell’s observations cannot be overestimated in sharpening the theological focus on the doctrine of indwelling.

One other factor needs to be considered before leaving John 14. The perspicuity of the context also demands that some sort of change in relationship will be taking place between the Holy Spirit and the disciples. The only one which fits the data herein and is in harmony with all the other passages associated with indwelling is the baptism into one corporate body which was historically initiated at Pentecost. As Teterud has well argued: “The only distinct ministry of the Holy Spirit between the Old Testament saint and the Church Age saint is the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The Church Age saint is united to a collective body in which the Holy Spirit is among united believers in Christ. The Holy Spirit is among (ἐν) the body of Christ...”<sup>70</sup> Specifically, “John 14:17 seems to predict that the Holy Spirit would be among the disciples collectively.”<sup>71</sup>

### ***John 20:22***

“The simple act of breathing, to symbolize the imparting of the Holy Spirit, is a pictorial method of presenting an invisible truth.”<sup>72</sup> After this initial concession is made, at least two items have to be settled.

The first involves the anarthrous πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Morris’ observations are very appropriate:

*Πνεῦμα Ἄγιον* is anarthrous from which some have drawn the conclusion that not the Holy Spirit, but a gift of the Spirit is in mind. This, however, seems very unlikely. The absence of the article may do no more than fasten our attention on the quality of the gift as Holy Spirit rather than on the individuality of the Spirit. But there is no solid reason to doubt what is meant here is “The Holy Spirit.”<sup>73</sup>

The second item has to do with the fulfillment of Jesus’ symbolic action. Was it immediate

---

<sup>69</sup> James Oliver Buswell, Jr., *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962), 1:115.

<sup>70</sup> Teterud, “The Abiding Spirit,” 62. The statement could be improved by changing “the baptism of the Holy Spirit” to “the baptism *in* or *with* the Holy Spirit” (cf. subsequent discussion on 1 Cor 12:13).

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>72</sup> Buswell, *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion*, 1:161. It was basically a visual aid intended to refresh the disciples’ minds concerning the teaching that they had received about the imminent bestowal of the Spirit so as to once again allay their fears and prepare them for the transition (cf. various OT prophetic actions and dramatizations).

<sup>73</sup> Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 846, n. 54. It is noteworthy that “this need not rule out any relation to the Spirit in the days of earlier discipleship any more than it rules out the Spirit’s coming upon them at Pentecost” (Everett F. Harrison, “The Gospel according to John, *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary* [Nashville: Southwestern Company, 1962] 1120).

or prophetic? Supporting “The Prophetic Interpretation,”<sup>74</sup> Buckley uses the context of the whole Gospel of John to make his case.

John 1:33 points ahead to the Day of Pentecost. John 7:39 points ahead to the Day of Pentecost. John 16:7 points ahead to the Day of Pentecost. Why should these then be fulfilled (even partially) at John 20:22?<sup>75</sup>

Since the evidences for indwelling within the Gospel of John have consistently pointed to Pentecost and a spiritual baptism into one corporate community, it is logically expedient to examine next the relationship of 1 Corinthians 12:13 to indwelling.

---

<sup>74</sup> Joseph G. Buckley, “‘A Johannine Pentecost?’ (An analysis of John 20:22)” (unpublished Master of Divinity Thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, May 1976), 61-63. Cf. Henry Barclay Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1964), 167.

<sup>75</sup> Buckley, 64.

## CHAPTER 2

### SIGNIFICANT DATA FROM PAUL'S CORINTHIAN CORRESPONDENCE

#### *1 Corinthians 12:13a*

The first part of 1 Cor 12:13 must be treated in reference to indwelling,<sup>76</sup> because it bridges the gap from the gospel evidence and provides an important piece to the whole puzzle of metaphorical continuity. As a matter of simple fact, the whole of chapter twelve brims with substantival and verbal metaphors.

Concerning the context, the Holy Spirit is prominent in verses 1-11 (cf. vv. 4, 7, 8, 9, 11), and the Body is prominent in verses 12-27.<sup>77</sup> Breaking the chapter down further into main and sub-emphases, “four ideas in the context seem quite relevant for this study: (1) the Holy Spirit, (2) the Body, (3) unity, and (4) diversity.”<sup>78</sup> Cottle does a good job at integrating these emphases when he says,

Paul then (in 12:12-27) works back from these various manifestations of the Spirit to the original act by which the Corinthians, and indeed all Christians, were incorporated into the Body of Christ, his purpose again being to show “variety in unity and unity in variety.” In the human body, which is essentially one, there are many members and they are differentiated by their functions. So the one Body of Christ into which we were all admitted by the one baptism of the Spirit also consists of a variety of members differentiated by the diversity of their functions (*energmaton*). Again the central teaching is clear “variety in unity and unity in variety.”<sup>79</sup>

Now it is important to plug some background into the picture prior to examining 1 Cor 12:13a in more detail. Passages such as Matthew 3:11,<sup>80</sup> John 1:33,<sup>81</sup> Acts 1:5,<sup>82</sup> and Acts 11:16<sup>83</sup> relate in a vital way to a proper understanding of 1 Cor 12:13a. The primary

---

<sup>76</sup> Only the first part of v.13 will be dealt with since it relates explicitly to indwelling. 1 Cor 12:13a emphasizes a vital association, while v.13b emphasizes a vital appropriation.

<sup>77</sup> For an excellent treatment see: Lyman Rand Tucker, Jr., “Spiritual Baptism in Paul’s Writings” (unpublished Master of Theology Thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, May 1978), 101.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Ronald E. Cottle, “All Were Baptized,” *JETS*, 17:2 (Spring 1974), 75. Once again, his “baptism of the Spirit” should more accurately be rendered “baptism *in* or *with* the Spirit.” For a good combined synopsis, pointing to the rendering of “*in the Spirit*” in 1 Cor 12:13, see: John R. W. Stott, *The Baptism and Fullness of the Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1964), 22-27.

<sup>80</sup> For discussion see: W. Merwin Forbes, “The Spiritual Baptism Of 1 Corinthians 12:13” (unpublished Master of Divinity Thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, May 1972), 46-49.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., 49-54.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 54-56.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 56-57.

question, especially in view of these and other passages which identify Christ as the Baptizer, is can *ἐν* be taken with *πνεύματι* so to mean the Spirit is the personal agent of this special baptism in the opening clause of 1 Cor. 12:13? Forbes points out that there are only three possibilities regarding the personal agent of 1 Corinthians 12:13: 1) that only the Holy Spirit is the agent of the baptism, 2) that only Christ is the agent of the baptism, or 3) that both Christ and the Holy Spirit share in the baptism, each to some degree yet to be determined.<sup>84</sup> It seems that, not only because of the affirmations from the gospels and Acts but also because of grammar, the second option is the correct one.

Atkinson appropriately points to those places where the personal agency of the Spirit is unquestionably in view when he says, “*ὑπό* with the genitive is used invariably to express the agency of the Holy Spirit (e.g. Mt. iv., 1; Lk. ii, 26; Acts, xiii, 4)”<sup>85</sup> More directly, Harris deals with the semantics and syntax of 1 Cor 12:13a. He credibly argues that *ἐν*

generally...has a local sense when used with *baptizō*: in the (river) Jordan (Matt. 3:6; Mk. 1:5 [= *eis ton Iordanén*, 1:9]), in the desert (MK 1:4), in Aenon (Jn. 3:23), in the cloud and in the sea (1 Cor. 10:2). *en hydati* denotes the element in which the baptized were “immersed” or with which they were “drenched” (Matt. 3:11; Jn. 1:26, 31, 33; Acts 11:16; cf. the simple dative *hydati* in Mk 1:8 v. 1.; Lk. 3:16; Acts 1:5; 11:16). So also with the phrase (*en*) *pneumati (hagiō)*, which is generally contrasted with (*en*) *hydati* (Matt. 3:12; Mk. 1:8 v. 1.; Lk. 3:16; Jn. 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16) believers are either immersed “in” the Spirit, or drenched “with” the Spirit.... Personal agency cannot be expressed simply by *pneumati* (cf. Funk, p. 195). For several reasons it seems probable that *en heni pneumati* in 1 Cor. 12:13 means not “by one Spirit” but “in (or with) one Spirit.” (a) Elsewhere *hypo* expresses personal agency with *baptizō*.... (b) There is no certain instance of an instrumental *en* with *baptizō*: in the other examples of *en pneumati*, the parallel with *en hydati* dictates that *en* should mean “in” or “with” and not “by (means of),” denoting the “sphere” or “material” but not the agent (but for instrumental *en* denoting personal agency, see Matt. 9:34; 12:24, 28; Acts 17:31 [cf. 4:12]; Phil. 4:13). (c) In the logia of John the Baptist regarding “Spirit-baptism,” it is always Jesus who is the baptizer, never the Spirit. Accordingly in 1 Cor. 12:13, the agent should be taken as implied (viz. Jesus Christ), (d) In the one place Paul uses *en* with *baptizō* (1 Cor. 10:2), the prep. is local in sense (“in the cloud and in the sea”), (e) The following phrase “we were all given one Spirit to drink” (1 Cor. 12:13b) suggests an inward participation in the Spirit to which a preceding outward “immersion in the Spirit” would correspond. The Spirit is both around (v. 13a) and within (v. 13b; cf. Eph. 5:18). (f) The parallel *en heni pneumati* in Eph. 2:18 cannot be an instrumental use of *en*, since *di’ autou* (= Christ) precedes (but cf. Eph 3:5; 4:30). However *en tō heni pneumati* in 1 Cor. 12:9 is

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>85</sup> Atkinson, “The Theology of Prepositions,” 18.

undoubtedly instrumental in sense, in light of the preceding *dia tou pneumatos* (1 Cor. 12:8; cf. w. 7, 8b, 11). To deny that *en* is instrumental in 1 Cor. 12:13 is not, of course, to deny the personality of the Spirit, but simply to recognize that *baptizō* need not always mean “to baptize in water,” but may be used metaphorically of immersion, inundation or deluging (see Arndt 131 s.v. *baptizō* 3. c).<sup>86</sup>

So, “the main clause of 1 Cor. 12:13 is concerned with...placing believers into the mystical Body of Christ, thus uniting them with their Lord and each other in a position of communion of life comparable to a physical body.”<sup>87</sup> The inceptions of this immersion for individuals would be coordinate with their conversions to Christ.<sup>88</sup> God’s goal (cf. the *εἰς*) is the incorporation of all believers into one Body wherein (cf. the *ἐν*) the Holy Spirit may be conceived of as the Soul of that whole spiritual organism (cf., also, e.g., Eph. 4:1-4).<sup>89</sup>

Concerning 1 Cor. 12:13a and its vital connection with indwelling, believers are *in Him*.

### ***1 Corinthians 3:16***

Paul employs the metaphor of a building under construction in 1 Corinthians 3:9b ff. The metaphor changes at verse 16, but this change is not totally divorced from the previous context:

The warning and the metaphor seem to come in somewhat abruptly, but there is a link of connexion, for *ναός* is only a definition of the previous metaphor *οἰκοδομή* (ver. 9). The building has now become a temple. Compare Eph. ii 20-22, where we have the same transition, first the building (*ἐποικοδομηθέντες*) then that building is defined as a temple (*εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον*), lastly that temple is described as the permanent abode (*εἰς κατοικητήριον*) of God in the spirit.<sup>90</sup>

Meyer corroborates, explaining, “But he has not yet set before their minds *what sort of an οἰκοδ. θεοῦ* they are, namely, the *temple* of God (hence *ναός* is emphatic).”<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> *NIDNTT*, 3:1210.

<sup>87</sup> Tucker, “Spiritual Baptism in Paul’s Writings,” 114. Concerning the force of *εἰς* in the phrase *εἰς ἔν σῶμα* as emphasizing “movement toward so as to be in,” see Fee’s discussion (Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT [Eerdmans, 1987], 606).

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Cottle, “All were Baptized,” 78ff.

<sup>89</sup> For the *metaphorically* spatial significance of *ἐν* and the *ultimately metaphorically* spatial connotation of *εἰς* (not to deny the concept of goal as it relates to action) in 1 Cor. 12:13a, see Best, *One Body in Christ*, 73. He concludes, “those who are baptized *into* Christ are those who afterwards are *in* Christ” (ibid.). Cf. also Best’s discussion of growth and completeness (ibid., 186ff.).

<sup>90</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*, reprinted (Winona Lake: Alpha Publications, n.d.), 196.

<sup>91</sup> Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistles of the Corinthians*, trans. by D. Douglas Bannerman, the translation rev. and ed. by William P. Dickson (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884), 78.

Gromacki identifies the important ideas concerning the immediate context, when he says,

Three basic warnings are given. The first warning is clear: Do not “defile the temple of God” (3:16-17). To avoid this sin, Paul wanted his readers to realize three truths: (1) corporately they were the temple of God, (2) the Spirit of God was dwelling in their midst, and (3) they were holy.<sup>92</sup>

The *οὐκ οἴδατε* may intimate a rebuke: “*Do you not know* (a Pauline expression; it is implied that they ought to know, perhaps that Paul himself had told them)...”<sup>93</sup> The first part of Paul’s reminder was that they corporately constituted the *ναός θεοῦ*.

Morris notes the anarthrous *ναός* and properly construes it:

There is no article before *temple* in the Greek, but this does not imply that there are various temples. It simply puts a certain emphasis on their character and God’s temple (though Godet renders “a temple of God” on the grounds that the local church and not the Church universal is in view).<sup>94</sup>

Much like Godet, Johnson desires to clarify the form theologically: “The *temple* is the local church, but surely the local church as the local manifestation of one true temple of God, the Church Invisible, composed of all true believers in Christ.”<sup>95</sup> Before leaving *ναός θεοῦ* it is well to reiterate the primary thought of the imagery, especially as it would pertain to indwelling: “The Apostle is speaking of the community, not of the individual Christian.”<sup>96</sup>

The second part of Paul’s reminder builds upon the first:

With an explicative *καί* Paul at once explains how he comes to call the Corinthians “God’s Sanctuary,” which is a term that certainly places them on a very high level: “and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.” The basic and self-evident proposition is this: where God dwells, there is his sanctuary.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Robert G. Gromacki, *Called to be Saints: An Exposition of 1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977), 49-50. Concerning Gromacki’s first and second points (i.e. based upon v. 16), the metaphorically spatial relationships should be noted.

<sup>93</sup> C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1971), 90. Also note Paul’s “do you not know” repeated six times in 1 Cor 6.

<sup>94</sup> Leon Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970), 69.

<sup>95</sup> S. Lewis Johnson, Jr., “The First Epistle to the Corinthians,” *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, 1235.

<sup>96</sup> Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistle of St. Paul*, 194.

<sup>97</sup> R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Augsburg 1963), 147.

Also, syntactically, Alford is careful to connect the *ἐν ὑμῖν* back to *ναός*: “καὶ ...ἐν ὑμῖν = ἐν ᾧ, τουτ – ἐστιν, ἐν ὑμῖν.”<sup>98</sup>

Lightfoot’s association of *οἶκεῖ* and *ναός* in this context is commendable:

The *ναός*, the inward shrine or sanctuary, was regarded as the abode of the deity (from *ναίειν* “to dwell”). Of course this was the case with heathen deities, but in a certain sense it was also true of the temple at Jerusalem; for though God “dwelleth not in temples made with hands” (Acts xvii.24), yet the symbol of His presence, the Shechinah, was there. Hence St. Luke (xi. 51) calls the inner temple the *οἶκος*, where another evangelist has *ναός* (Matt, xxiii. 35). Observe however that, in the case of the Christian community, the word is appropriate not because the image of the deity was there, as in heathen temples, nor the symbol, as in the Jewish temple, but because the Spirit of God was the Indweller.<sup>99</sup>

Corporate implications undeniably permeate the whole verse:

Paul did not mean to say that each person is God’s temple and that the Spirit of God dwells inside each person. He had been writing about the church as a building, and it is clear that here he meant the congregation of persons who composed the Corinthian church.... God’s sanctuary was no longer a material building but was rather the collection of people among whom God’s Spirit dwells.<sup>100</sup>

## ***2 Corinthians 6:16***

2 Corinthians 6:16 is treated next, because the passage unequivocally relates back to the Old Testament<sup>101</sup> and its emphasis demands a corporate conception of indwelling: “For we are the temple of the living God; just as God said, ‘I WILL DWELL IN THEM AND WALK AMONG THEM...’ (2 Cor 6:16b, c, NASB). Hughes responds to the minor differences in the Scripture quotation and summarizes the imagery, when he notes that

the change in the pronouns from the second to the third person plural is explained by reference to Ezek, 37:26ff.... It in no way affects the sense. Nor does the change from “I will set my tabernacle among you” to “I will dwell in them”; for to set one’s tabernacle among signifies to dwell in or

---

<sup>98</sup> Alford, *Alford’s Greek Testament*, 3:495.

<sup>99</sup> Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistle of St. Paul*, 194. Cf. Meyer: “God, as he dwelt in the actual temple by the *שכינה*..., dwells in the ideal temple of the Christian church by the gracious presence, walking and ruling in it, of *His Spirit*, in whom God communicates Himself...” (*Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians*, 78).

<sup>100</sup> William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther, *1 Corinthians*, AB (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1976), 174.

<sup>101</sup> For a good survey of the OT background and the imagery, see: Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *Paul’s Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 251-55. For some generally conceptual parallels from the OT, cf. Exod 25:8; 29:45; Lev 26:12; Ezek 37:27; 49:9; Zech 2:11; etc.

among: the tabernacle of the Lord, and in particular the ark of the covenant which was within the innermost sanctuary of the Holy of Holies, was a guarantee to the Israelites of the presence of God in their midst.<sup>102</sup>

### ***1 Corinthians 6:12-20***<sup>103</sup>

Most likely the present context represents a transitional development of the imagery encountered in 1 Corinthians 3:16-17.<sup>104</sup> There is also a forward orientation concerning this imagery; Gundry well points out that the phrase “Members of Christ” in 1 Corinthians 6:15 is “an anticipation of ‘the body of Christ’ in ch. 12”:<sup>105</sup>

...*melos* here and *sōma* in ch. 12 have a figurative meaning when used ecclesiastically. The figure rests, however, on a strictly physical definition of *melos* (and in ch. 12, *sōma*). Verse 15a simply anticipates the figure of the Church as Christ’s Body.<sup>106</sup>

Miner adds a logical corroboration, when he argues:

In this passage, of course, Paul does not use the phrase “the body of Christ,” nor does he speak directly of the church; this pattern of thought is not absent, however, because he speaks so strongly about the bodies of all believers as members (*melē*) of Christ. It is impossible to visualize members apart from the body to which they belong.<sup>107</sup>

Consequently, the contextual conclusions of Orr and Walther are essentially credible:

Paul develops somewhat a concept which he suggested in 3:16-17, that Christian society is the particular sphere in which the Holy Spirit

---

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., 253. Thrall well argues that contextually “in vi. 16-18 there is strong emphasis upon the close and gracious relationship between God and His people” (M. E. Thrall, “The Problem of II Cor. VI. 14—VII. 1 in Some Recent Discussion” *NTS*, 24:1 [October, 1977]: 145). For more detailed commentary with a special emphasis on “the church as the corporate place of God’s dwelling” see Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Eerdmans, 1987), 149-150.

<sup>103</sup> On the likelihood of Corinthian slogans of a “neoplatonic” / “protognostic” nature in this passage and how Paul responds to them, see: Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Eerdmans, 2000), 460 ff.

<sup>104</sup> Schweizer explicitly says of 1 Cor 6:19 “that Paul is not thinking individualistically may be seen from 1 C. 3:16, where the whole community is this temple” (*TDNT*, 7:1064, n. 400). On the tightly knit metaphorical continuity of 1 Cor 3:16-17, 1 Cor 6:19, and 2 Cor 6:16, see: Christfried Böttrich, “‘Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes’: Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde dei Paulus,” *Gemeinde ohne Tempel* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1999).

<sup>105</sup> Robert H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 29, Matthew Black and R. McL. Wilson, eds. (Cambridge: University Press, 1976), 60.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 61. Gundry’s whole chapter (i.e., ch. 7: “*Sōma* in I Cor. 6:12-20”) is excellent.

<sup>107</sup> Paul S. Miner, *Images of the Church in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960), 182.

operates. His Introduction of *the body* is significant; it will be developed in startling dimensions in chs. 11 and 12. At this point he is trying to impress his readers that they collectively are Christ's body....<sup>108</sup>

From the above discussion, it can already be seen that the issue of the usages of *σῶμα* in 1 Corinthians 6:12-20 is the crucial hermeneutical challenge. The noun *σῶμα* occurs eight times in this passage, and a wide range of opinion is demonstrated concerning its usage (i.e. from all physical to all figurative, plus a variety of combinations in between).

Since “the word *σῶμα* has a wide range of meaning,... our first task must be to elucidate its precise connotation in v. 15.”<sup>109</sup> Barrett aptly shows the relationship of the two halves of verse 15. Of 1 Corinthians 6:15a, he notes:

Compare Rom. xii 5; Col. i. 18, 24; Paul uses the metaphor of the body in various ways. In xii. 12-27 there is one body of Christ; here the many human bodies are members of Christ, each several one united to him, and (ideally) at his disposal for use as he wills.<sup>110</sup>

Then, of verse 15b, he observes that “the imagery shifts slightly, for Paul, writing now in individual terms, thinks of the members that make up one human body.”<sup>111</sup> As a point of qualification, Gundry would add, “Of course, the physical bodies of believers make up the reality to which the metaphor ‘Body of Christ’ points, simply because physical bodies form part of the constitution of believers and therefore belong to Christ.”<sup>112</sup> In addition to these observations, Best would stress that “the phrase ‘members of Christ’ suggests, however, a very close identity between Christ and the community of believers....”<sup>113</sup> All of these are important pieces to the interpretive puzzle.

In light of these observations, Orr and Walther render verse 15: “Do you not know that your bodies are parts of the body of Christ? Shall I take the parts of the body of Christ, then, and make them parts of the body of a prostitute? Certainly not!”<sup>114</sup> In other words, verse 15a clearly implies Paul's metaphorical *σῶμα*, and verse 15b individuates.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>108</sup> Orr and Walther, *I Corinthians*, 203.

<sup>109</sup> Best, *One body in Christ*, 78. For example, on this “wide range of meaning” in this context, Klein argues, “The notion of a body is developed from merely the corporeal to an expression of the mystical relationship the Corinthian believers had to Christ. Thus, to practice sexual debauchery is to prostitute the very body of Christ - a thought inconceivable to Paul” (George L. Klein, “Hos 3:1-3 - Background to 1 Cor 6:19b-20,” *Criswell Theological Journal*, 3:2 [Spring 1989]: 373).

<sup>110</sup> Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 148.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid. For a similar shift from a corporate emphasis to individual ramifications, cf. 1 Cor. 6:15-18 with Rom. 8:9 in its immediate context.

<sup>112</sup> Gundry, *Sōma*, 229.

<sup>113</sup> Best, *One Body in Christ*, 78.

<sup>114</sup> *I Corinthians*, 198.

<sup>115</sup> Even Jewett (based upon the introductory *οὐκ οἶδατε*) seems to acknowledge an implicit reference to ecclesiastical *σῶμα* in verse 15a (Robert Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: a Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971] 283).

Gundry pulls together an appropriate synthesis of the data including a proper orientation to the occasion of the whole passage and a credible conception of both the physical and spiritual realities involved in the immediate context:

In Paul's own thought, the twin truths add up to this: the whole man, body [cf. w. 13b, 15b] and spirit [cf. v. 17], belongs to the Lord. Therefore, illicit union with a harlot, although it is "merely" physical, as the Corinthians would say effects the oneness of the physical relationship which contradicts the Lord's claim over the body and creates a disparity between the body (now given over to a harlot) and the spirit (still united to the Lord).<sup>116</sup>

Excerpts from the conclusion of Orr and Walther which emphasize the metaphorical elements of the passage are also germane:

Since human bodies are *parts of the body of Christ*, Paul declares it unthinkable that they participate in prostitution.... He may well have in mind also that the prostitute in Corinth, as well as in many other ancient cities, was dedicated to the service of pagan gods. To resort to such a person was to effect union with the god she served. The Christian has dedicated his body to be a part of Christ's body, and he is therefore dedicated to the God of Christ. Joining the Lord makes a person *one spirit with him*, that is, Christians unite with other Christians to constitute *the body of Christ, which is guided by the Spirit, which inhabits the whole body*. Paul's view of sexual immorality, therefore, as a particularly inner sin, is precisely applicable to his doctrine of the body of Christ.<sup>117</sup>

1 Corinthians 6:19 is a difficult verse to integrate into a harmonious synthesis of the doctrine of indwelling. However, Minear points to a potential key which could unlock the problem: "Their body (the singular may be significant) has become a temple established by the indwelling Spirit."<sup>118</sup> It is not necessary to take *σῶμα* distributively,<sup>119</sup> An individualistically physical and spacial indwelling is not demanded. For example, Barrett,

---

<sup>116</sup> Gundry, *Sōma*, 69. Concerning the occasion of Paul's argument in I Cor. 6:12ff., Gundry reiterates, "Hence, contrary to Corinthian belief, the body cannot sin with impurity apart from the spirit" (ibid.).

<sup>117</sup> Orr and Walther, *I Corinthians*, 203. My thinking is not in agreement plenary with their arguments in reference to ecclesiastical *σῶμα* as it relates to the concept of indwelling. Nevertheless, their essential perspective eliminates many of the interpretive expedients normally associated with the whole passage. Consider, for example, the possibilities of ecclesiastical *σῶμα* in verse 18. For a good argument applying metaphorical *σῶμα* to verse 18, see: R. Kempthorne, "Incest and the Body of Christ: A Study of 1 Corinthians VI. 12-20," *NTS* 14:4 (July 1968): 572. He even handles the problems of *ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος* and *τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα* (ibid.).

<sup>118</sup> Minear, *Images of the Church in the New Testament*, 180.

<sup>119</sup> It seems that often when encountering a singular noun with a plural pronoun of possession, we have become too quick interpretively on the distributive trigger. Consequently, we may be robbing ourselves of many precious pictures of ecclesiastical union. For some discussion and data, see the Addendum to this paper, "Singulars in Plural Settings."

while commenting on 2 Corinthians 6:16, says, “For the church as God’s temple (*ναός*) see I Cor. iii.16; vi. 19,... especially the latter passage, since there Paul thinks of a corporate rather than an individual indwelling.”<sup>120</sup> Similarly Von Medding stresses that “Paul stands quite clearly on the basis of Jewish tradition when he speaks of the *naos*: the redeemed community is the temple of God (1 Cor. 3:16ff.), and God’s Spirit dwells in her (1 Cor. 6:19;...).”<sup>121</sup> To this must be added a pertinent observation concerning the *ἐν ὑμῖν* of verse 19: “*ἐν ὑμῖν* ‘among you,’ in the community etc., is common in Paul. Of 18 instances in 1 C, 13 plainly have this sense: 1:10f; 2:2; 3:3, 18; 5:1; 6:5; 11:18f, 30; 14:25; 15:12, and it is implied in 3:16; 6:19 on the basis of 14:25.”<sup>122</sup>

Kemphorne well articulates the corporate view:

At least two difficulties usually arise in vi. 19. The language of the temple, *ναός*, for the body of the individual is admitted to be unique in the NT; and “the meaning of *sōma* fluctuates strangely” here as in the whole passage—is Paul thinking of the physical body or of the whole person? But these problems do not exist if he is now writing unequivocally of the corporate Body. He is thus using *ναός* in just the same way as at iii 16f., II Cor. vi. 16 (and Eph. ii. 21). The phrase *ναός τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν Ἁγίου Πνεύματος* thus means “the temple of the Holy Spirit who is in (or with, among) you.” The absence of an article before *ναός* presents no obstacle, because it is also found without article in all the three other passages cited, where there is only one temple. The language of the temple is developed in just the same way at iii. 16, where the Spirit is likewise said to be *ἐν ὑμῖν*.

Instead of singular *τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν* (repeated in the dative in 20), the “individual” interpretation really requires the plural as at 15. This point alone tends to outweigh the difficulty of *ὑμῶν* qualifying “the Body” when Paul is more given to expressions like *ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ*, xii. 27. In the context it is not hard to take *ὑμῶν* as a descriptive or appositional genitive “the Body of which you are members,” especially if there has been a corporate allusion in to *τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα*, 18.<sup>123</sup>

This interpretation is most appealing especially because of the continuity of imagery.

<sup>120</sup> C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC, 199.

<sup>121</sup> *TDNT*, 3:784.

<sup>122</sup> Delling, *TDNT*, 7:498, n. 63. Concerning both the *τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν* and the *ἐν ὑμῖν* of v.19, note the renderings and some brief explanations of Orr and Walther: “the body of you people. It is requisite to indicate somehow that the second person personal pronouns in this and the following verse are plural. The idea is an extension of that in 3:16-17...among you. As often, it is a question whether to employ the alternative translation ‘in you.’ The force of the plural pronouns has determined the choice here” (*1 Corinthians*, 200).

<sup>123</sup> “Incest and the Body of Christ,” 572-73.

## CHAPTER 3

### SUPPORTING DATA FROM OTHER SOURCES

#### *Ephesians 2:20-22*

This Pauline passage has already been mentioned briefly within the discussion of 1 Cor 3:16. Very significant is the fact that there are “strong points of contact”<sup>124</sup> with 1 Corinthians, chapters 3 through 12. In Ephesians 2 metaphors of the church abound. For example, it speaks of the “body” (i.e. the ecclesiological body of Christ, v. 16) as “one new man” (v. 15),<sup>125</sup> of “fellow citizens” (i.e. of a common state, v. 19), of “housemates,” (v. 19)<sup>126</sup> and of a building under construction (w. 20-21). The *οἶκος* word group predominates in the last four verses. It was particularly suitable to Paul’s overlapping and interweaving of ecclesiastical metaphors. As Lincoln notes:

In these verses the writer introduces building and temple imagery for the new community of the church, of which his Gentile Christian readers had now become a part. The transition in his thought is facilitated by the ability of *οἶκος* (cf. *οἶκος* in v. 19) to refer to household, house, or temple. The imagery at the beginning of v. 20 involves the readers’ being depicted as bricks which have been built up in a building on top of a foundation (cf. also v. 22).<sup>127</sup>

The unfolding of these word pictures very closely parallels their development in 1 Cor. 3:1-17. The “whole building” (*πάσα οἰκοδομή*) of Eph 2:21a is subsequently more specifically identified as “a holy sanctuary” (*ναὸς ἅγιον*) in 2:21b which in turn is further described as “a dwelling-place of God in the Spirit.” The “*ἐν πνεύματι*, ‘in the Spirit,’ performs a similar function to that of *ἐν κυρίῳ*, ‘in the Lord’ [cf. end of v. 21].”<sup>128</sup> Specifically, in connection with the indwelling of v. 22, “*ἐν πνεύματι* defines the mode of inhabitation.... The Father dwells in the Spirit in that temple of which the Son is the chief corner-stone.”<sup>129</sup>

The advancing metaphors of Eph. 2:11ff. emphasize the Spirit’s dwelling in the whole building, i.e. in God’s holy sanctuary. This structure is indeed made up of individual building blocks, but the Spirit is not viewed as spatially indwelling each one of these bricks.

---

<sup>124</sup> Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Ephesians: A Commentary*, trans. by Helen Heron (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 125.

<sup>125</sup> In this context with an inclusive racial emphasis (i.e. Jews and Gentiles). This is a subset of the general corporate and eschatological metaphor found later in Eph 4:24, “the new man.”

<sup>126</sup> “Housemates” being “full members of His [i.e. God’s] family” (F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Ephesians* [London: Pickering & Inglis, 1961], 56).

<sup>127</sup> Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC (Dallas: Word, 1990), 152.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 158.

<sup>129</sup> John Eadie, *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Baker, reprint, 1979), 207.

So, once again, what is depicted is a corporate edifice in which God resides in the Spirit.<sup>130</sup> This corporate emphasis is primary; however, its metaphorical primacy does not negate the relational significance of the Spirit's abiding presence with that structure's individual building stones.

### *1 Peter 2:4-5*

Like Paul, Peter is skilled in multiplying metaphors.<sup>131</sup> In 1 Peter 2:4-8 the key word "stone" (*λίθος*) tags the main metaphor of that section. Verses 4 and 5 implicitly corroborate the picture of indwelling developed in Paul's discussions of it. As Peter moves from v. 4 to v. 5 there is a conspicuous shift from the One (i.e. Christ) to the many (i.e. believers).<sup>132</sup> 1 Peter 2:4 refers to Christ as "a living stone." In verse 5, this imagery is extended to "you also." These "living stones," in turn, "are being built up (*οἰκοδομεῖσθε*) as a spiritual house (*οἶκος*)." Based upon the metaphorical data, Best asserts:

The description of the church as the temple of God is the nearest this letter comes to the Pauline metaphor of the Body of Christ... *Spiritual...* is always associated with the Spirit of God. I Cor. 3:16; Eph. 2:22 would suggest that the Spirit dwells in the house.<sup>133</sup>

More dogmatically, Glenny asserts, "In calling believers a spiritual house, Peter means that they are the temple of God, the place where God dwells in this age."<sup>134</sup>

"Just as in the metaphor of the Body, there are different members, so also in the building there are different stones."<sup>135</sup> Expanding the circles of metaphorical inclusion outward, Best builds his extension largely upon the *συναρμολογουμένη* of Ephesians 2:21:

The impression is given that each Christian is a stone and that the builder

---

<sup>130</sup> Cf. some excerpted comments from Hoehner's monumental commentary on Ephesians: "The emphasis is not individual growth but corporate growth.... Hence it [i.e. *κατοικητήριον*] has the idea of the 'place of deep or settled dwelling.'... It signifies the endurance and permanence of God's inhabitation in the body of believers" (Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: On Exegetical Commentary* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002], 411, 413, 414). Hoehner, however, without exegetical documentation, assumes a physical indwelling of the bodies of individual Christians in 1 Cor 6:19 (ibid., 414-415).

<sup>131</sup> For an excellent treatment of Peter's various word pictures in 1 Peter 2, see W. Edward Glenny, "The Israelite Imagery of 1 Peter 2," *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church*, ed. by Blaising and Bock (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992). 156-187. Cf. also John Hall Elliot, *The Elect and the Holy: An Exegetical Examination of 1 Peter 2:4-10 and the Phrase βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα*, Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1966), 148ff. Also, on metaphorical continuity, see Bo Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude*, AB, 90-91. On the simile, see Paul R. Fink, "An analysis of Peter's Literary Style and Its Contribution to the Exegesis of the Petrine Epistles" (unpublished Doctor of Theology Dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, May 1967), 191-92.

<sup>132</sup> Glenny rightly characterizes this shift as one from Christology to ecclesiology ("The Israelite Imagery of 1 Peter 2," 161).

<sup>133</sup> Ernest Best, *1 Peter*, NCBC (Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, 1971), 102.

<sup>134</sup> "The Israelite Imagery of 1 Peter 2," 162.

<sup>135</sup> Best, *One Body in Christ*, 165.

(God) takes particular care in fitting the stones together; each stone has its place in the building, just as each member has its place in the Body. Thus the building grows and reveals its final shape; the whole takes place in Christ.<sup>136</sup>

Furthermore, he notes:

The building is complete, the chief corner stone having already been put in position; yet it still grows. This paradox of completion, or perfection, with growth we also found in the metaphor of the Body and the Head. In our present case the conception of growth in size emerges explicitly for the first time: Christians as stones are being added to the temple; it will only be complete and perfect when their full number is built in; should one be missing the building will not be perfectly finished. The conception of growth in quality is not thus wholly absent, but its form differs from that of the Head-Body metaphor.<sup>137</sup>

Irrespective of minor nuances of difference all such metaphors share in common a corporate emphasis. The adding of “living stones” in 1 Peter 2:5 is a given for growth, but that does not mean that each and every one of them is being conceived of as an individual “spiritual house.” There are many stones, but only one holy House in which God dwells in the Spirit.

---

<sup>136</sup> Ibid., 167-168.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid.

## SUMMARY – CONCLUSION

There are various ecclesiastical metaphors which aid in the understanding of the doctrine of indwelling. There are also interrelationships between these word pictures which help to provide metaphorical continuity.<sup>138</sup> In reference to the Church, the question may be asked, “How is this unit or whole described?”<sup>139</sup> The answers are quick in coming: “Sometimes as a ‘building’ (Eph. 2:21, 22); sometimes as a ‘body’ (Rom. 12:5); sometimes as ‘one man’ (Gal 3:28).”<sup>140</sup>

Such imagery demands a corporate emphasis.<sup>141</sup> Consequently, Smeaton concludes that “these illustrations suffice to prove that Christians are a corporate society, a habitation of God in the Spirit, and that He...truly dwells in the Church by His Spirit...”<sup>142</sup> “The church is called one body because the Spirit operates in that body.”<sup>143</sup> Herein is the essence of the biblical doctrine of indwelling.

Indeed, if “indwelling is the abiding presence of the Spirit,”<sup>144</sup> it must not be conceived of as the Godhead spatially possessing individual physical bodies. Such a conception flies in the face of the biblical data since

as the close parallels in I Cor. 3:16; II Cor. 6:16, Heb. 3:6; I Pet. 2:5; 4:17; Eph. 2:21; Rev. 3:12; Barn. 4:11; 6:15ff.; 16:1ff.; Ig. Eph. 9:1; 15:3 and Ig. Mag. 7:2 indicate, not only the Pauline congregations but the entire early church held the belief that they were God’s temple, not that their bodies were God’s temple.<sup>145</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> Cf. Minear, *Images of the Church in the New Testament*, 180.

<sup>139</sup> Best, *One Body in Christ*, 20.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid.

<sup>141</sup> “That the community is itself the temple... is a belief common to the whole of the NT witness: 1C. 3:9, 16f.; cf. 6:19f. (the body); 2 C. 6:16f.; Eph. 2:19-22” (G. Schrenk, “ἱερός, κτλ.,” *TDNT*, 3:247). Cf. O. Michel’s “‘House of God’ as an Early Christian Image for the Community,” *TDNT*, 5:126-127, 144.

<sup>142</sup> George Smeaton, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, reprinted, 1974), 266.

<sup>143</sup> Markus Barth, “A chapter on the Church - The Body of Christ: Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 12,” *Int*, 12:2 (April 1958): 153.

<sup>144</sup> Walvoord, *The Holy Spirit*, 155. Note that this is a workable definition as long as it is taken in the light of the total presentation of the biblical data contained in this paper.

<sup>145</sup> Robert Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms*, 284.

## ADDENDA

### SINGULARS IN PLURAL SETTINGS

The issue of discord in grammatical number as it pertains to substantives in general is quite complex. Furthermore, when it comes to singular nouns in plural settings in the NT, many different factors or a combination thereof often come into play. Some of these factors relate to Semitic background, text-critical issues (i.e. in the OT, full and defective writings, esp. before pronominal suffixes; in the NT, manuscript variants, differences in parallel passages, etc.), form (e.g. proverbial language), possibilities of double-entendre, metaphorical-theological emphases on solidarity, etc.

Although it is important not to deny that the NT does exhibit collective, generic, and distributive singulars, we ought not be too quick in applying these interpretive labels to all, or even most, of these singular nouns with plural associations. Many grammarians and commentators automatically do just that in verses such as 1 Cor 6:19, 20 (cf., e.g., MHT, 3, *Syntax*, Nigel Turner, 23).

Consider the raw data pertaining to four theologically significant nouns in the NT. This data was assembled by surveying and sub-classifying concordance entries from MG. Also, for a likely example of metaphorical-theological override, consider the *μετά τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν* (“with your [pl] spirit [sg]”) in Philem 25. Besides the occasion of this nearly exclusively personal letter which deals with a spiritual change in relationship between a slave owner and his slave, consider this epistle’s implicit teaching on the *solidarity* of one “Spirit” and one Body irrespective of societal classes and the like (cf., e.g., 1 Cor 7:21-24; ch. 12; Gal 3:28; Eph 2:11-22; 4:1-6; etc.).

## *καρδία*

<b>Singulars in</b>	<b>Plural Settings</b>	<b>Plurals in</b>	<b>Plural Settings</b>
Mt 13:15 (x2)	Acts 28:27 (x2)	Mt 9:4	Gal 4:6
Mt 15:8	Rom 1:21	Mk 2:6	Eph 3:17
Mk 3:5	Rom 6:17	Mk 2:8	Eph 6:22
Mk 7:6	2 Cor 3:15	Lk 1:17	Phil 4:7
Mk 7:21	2 Cor 5:12	Lk 3:15	Col 2:2
Mk 8:17	2 Cor 6:11	Lk 5:22	Col 3:15
Lk 1:51	Eph 1:18	Lk 16:15	Col 3:16
Lk 1:66	Eph 4:18	Lk 21:14	Col 4:8
Lk 8:12	Eph 5:19	Lk 21:34	1 Thes 2:4
Lk 8:15	Eph 6:5	Acts 7:39	1 Thes 3:13
Lk 9:47	Col 3:22	Acts 7:51	2 Thes 2:17
Lk 12:34	1 Tim 1:5	Acts 7:54	2 Thes 3:5
Lk 24:25	2 Tim 2:22	Acts 14:17	Heb 3:8
Lk 24:32	Heb 10:22a	Acts 15:9	Heb 3:15
Lk 24:38	Heb 13:9	Rom 1:24	Heb 4:7
John 12:40	Jms 3:14	Rom 2:15	Heb 10:22b
John 14:1	1 Pet 1:22	Rom 5:5	Jms 4:8
John 14:27	2 Pet 2:14	Rom 16:18	Jms 5:5
John 16:6	1 Jn 3:19	1 Cor 4:5	Jms 5:8
John 16:22	1 Jn 3:20	2 Cor 1:22	1 Pet 3:15
Acts 2:37	1 Jn 3:21	2 Cor 3:2	2 Pet 1:19
Acts 4:32		2 Cor 4:6	Rev 17:17
		2 Cor 7:3	

### **Plurals in a Singular Setting**

Mt 18:35

### **Ambivalent**

Heb 8:10

Heb 10:16

\*Note, e.g., a singular with a proverbial collective singular usage in Mt 15:18, 19.

# σῶμα

<b>Singulars in</b>	<b>Plural Settings</b>	<b>Plurals in Plural Settings</b>
Mt 6:25	1 Cor 12:22	Mt 27:52
Mt 10:28	1 Cor 12:27	Rom 1:24
Lk 12:4	1 Cor 15:35	Rom 8:11
Lk 12:22	2 Cor 4:10	Rom 12:1
Rom 6:12	2 Cor 5:6	1 Cor 6:15
Rom 8:13	2 Cor 5:8	Eph 5:28
Rom 8:23	Eph 2:16	Heb 13:11
Rom 12:4	Eph 4:4	
Rom 12:5	Eph 4:12	
1 Cor 6:19	Eph 4:16	
1 Cor 6:20	Eph 5:30	
1 Cor 10:17	Phil 3:21	
1 Cor 12:12	Col 2:11	
1 Cor 12:13	Col 2:19	
1 Cor 12:14	Col 3:15	
1 Cor 12:15	1 Thes 5:23	
1 Cor 12:16	Heb 10:22	
1 Cor 12:17	Heb 13:3	
1 Cor 12:18	Jms 2:16	
1 Cor 12:19	Jms 3:3	
1 Cor 12:20		

# ψυχή

<b>Singulars in Plural Settings</b>	<b>Plurals in Plural Settings</b>
Mt 6:25	Mt 11:29
Mt 10:28	Lk 21:19
Lk 12:22	Acts 2:41
John 10:24	2 Cor 12:15
Acts 4:32	1 Thes 2:8
Eph 6:6	Heb 12:3
Phil 1:27	Heb 13:17
Col 3:23	Jms 1:21
1 Thes 5:23	1 Pet 1:9
Heb 6:19	1 Pet 1:22
Heb 10:39	1 Pet 2:25
1 Pet 2:11	1 Pet 3:20
Rev 12:11	1 Pet 4:19
	1 Jn 3:16
	Rev 6:9
	Rev 18:13
	Rev 20:4

## \*Anthropological *πνεῦμα*

<b>Singulars in Plural Settings</b>	<b>Plurals in Plural Settings</b>
Mt 5:3	1 Cor 14:32
Mt 26:41	Heb 12:23
Mk 14:38	Rev 22:6
Rom 8:16	
1 Cor 16:18	
2 Cor 7:1	
Eph 4:23	
Phil 1:27	
Phil 4:23	
1 Thes 5:23	
Philem 25	

\* Anthropological *πνεῦμα* in many NT contexts should probably be regarded as Pneumatological / anthropological *πνεῦμα*, i.e., “S / spirit.”