

Implications of Paul's "One Flesh" Concept for His Understanding of the Nature of Man

S. AARON SON
DALLAS BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

Closely related to his σῶμα concept, Paul's view of the sexual union as "one flesh (body)" has significant implications not only for his understanding of the nature of man but also of the relationship between Christ and the church. Paul derives this concept from Gen 2:24 and uses it as the biblical basis for his argument, explicitly in 1 Cor 6:12-20; Eph 5:21-33; and implicitly in 1 Cor 7:10-16. In this article, I examine these and other related passages to determine whether and in what respect Paul understands man as a corporate being.

Key Words: Pauline anthropology, one flesh

Paul's view of the nature of the sexual union regarded as "one flesh" underlies his teachings on sexual purity, marriage, and divorce. Closely related to his σῶμα concept, it has significant implications not only for his view of the nature of man¹ but also for the relationship between Christ and the church. Paul refers to the "one flesh" concept explicitly in 1 Cor 6:12-20; Eph 5:21-33; and implicitly in 1 Cor 7:10-16. In addition, there are a number of other Pauline texts that are of interest for this study. They are 1 Cor 11:2-16; 2 Cor 11:2-3; and 1 Tim 2:8-3:1a.² Although these passages do not explicitly refer to Paul's

1. In my opinion, the generic use of the term *man*, as it is employed in standard English, is theologically important for a study of Pauline anthropology because no other term embraces both the individual and the corporate dimensions of human personality.

2. This study assumes the authenticity of all thirteen canonical letters of Paul for the following reasons: (1) The nineteenth-century Baur tradition that rejects Pauline authorship of a number of the letters (e.g., Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, and the Pastoral Letters) and dates them much later than Paul's death is open to a serious question and appears to involve doubtful literary presuppositions. This currently dominant tradition normally rests its argument on vocabulary, style, and theological concepts. It often does not fully consider, however, changing circumstances or subject matter, the use of nonauthorial pre-formed traditions, and the use of the amanuensis in Paul's letters. (2) Even if the Baur tradition is assumed to be true, the argument developed in this study will not be greatly affected because it is strongly supported by

"one flesh" concept, they bear on the interpretation of Eph 5:21-33, particularly on Paul's view of the husband as the head of his wife, of Christ as the head of the church, and of the church as the bride of Christ. In the present study, I investigate these relevant passages exegetically and hope to determine what implications Paul's "one flesh" concept has for his view of the nature of man.

ANALYSIS OF PAUL'S USAGE

1 Corinthians 6:12-20

Paul's "one flesh" concept appears in 1 Cor 6:12-20, a passage in which Paul strongly condemns sexual immorality. He roots the condemnation in his understanding of the body (σῶμα), arguing that an immoral sexual relationship with a prostitute makes a member of Christ a member of a prostitute (6:15), for "He who is united (ὁ κολλώμενος) to a prostitute becomes one body (ἐν σῶμα) with her" (6:16). This concept is derived from Gen 2:24b, "The two shall become one flesh (μὶα σάρξ)." Although Paul does not include here the first part of Gen 2:24, "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife," he implies it with the term κολλᾶσθαι (6:16-17), a cognate of the compound word προσκολλᾶσθαι used in Gen 2:24.³ The basic concept that Paul advocates here is that sexual relationship with a prostitute creates a union with her that is real and inevitably conflicts with the union that a believer has with Christ.

passages in the Pauline Letters that the Baur tradition does not question. See F. C. Baur, *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity* (rev. ed.; ed. and trans. Eduard Zeller and A. Menzies; London: Williams and Norgate, 1876). For a critique of the Baur tradition, see Theodor Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. John Moore Trout and others; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909); and, more recently, E. Earle Ellis, *Making of the New Testament Documents* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 320-29; idem, "Toward a History of Early Christianity," *Christ and the Future in New Testament History* (Leiden: Brill, 2000) 212-41. For a list of scholars' opinions on Pauline authorship of each disputed book, see my *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology: A Study of Selected Terms, Idioms, and Concepts in the Light of Paul's Usage and Background* (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1999) 5-6 n. 9.

3. Both terms are frequently employed to denote sexual union. Matt 19:5 (supported by B D W θ 078 087 I³ and so forth) and 1 Cor 6:16 use κολλᾶσθαι, while Mark 10:7 and Eph 5:31 employ προσκολλᾶσθαι in their citation of Gen 2:24. J. I. Miller ("A Fresh Look at I Corinthians 6:16f.," *NTS* 27 [1980] 127) argues that by removing a prefix Paul takes the directly sexual reference away from this passage (6:16-17). His argument is, however, not convincing because the noncompound form is also used in Sir 19:2 to denote sexual relationship with a harlot. For further discussion, see K. L. Schmidt, "κολλάω, προσκολλάω," in *TDNT* 3.822-23.

In the following verse (1 Cor 6:17), therefore, Paul applies the "one flesh" concept to the union between Christ and believers: "But he who is united to the Lord becomes one spirit (ἐν πνεύμα) with him." Although the same word, κολλᾶσθαι, is used to describe the believer's union with Christ, it does not necessarily mean that believers are united with Christ by physical means.⁴ This analogy does suggest, however, that Paul conceives the union with Christ to be as real as the physical union created by sexual intercourse.⁵ Interestingly, he describes the union with Christ as "one spirit (ἐν πνεύμα) rather than as "one body (ἐν σῶμα)." This, however, does not mean that the union with Christ is purely "spiritual" whereas the union with a prostitute is purely "physical." This is evident in that "one spirit with him [the Lord]" is a direct parallel to "one body with her [a harlot]" (6:16). Paul probably implies here that the believer's union with Christ is effected by the Holy Spirit. Although Paul does not explain in this chapter how believers were united to Christ, he writes elsewhere that they were united to Christ in baptism, that is, baptism in the Spirit, and as a result they have become corporately the body of Christ and individually members of it (1 Cor 12:12-13, 27).⁶ The "one spirit" that believers form with Christ, therefore, refers to either the "spiritual body"⁷ or the "corporate body of Christ created by the Holy Spirit."⁸

1 Corinthians 7:10-16

Paul's instructions on divorce in 1 Cor 7:10-16 also involve the "one flesh" concept. They concern two situations: (1) a marriage in which both partners are believers (7:10-11) and (2) a marriage in which

4. The physical nature of the union with Christ via the sacraments is stressed to an extreme by Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (trans. William Montgomery; London: Black, 1931) 127-28; and John A. T. Robinson, *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology* (Chicago: Regnery, 1952) 50-53; while it is rejected completely by Robert H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976) 68-69; and to a certain extent by Ernest Best, *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistle of the Apostle Paul* (London: S.P.C.K., 1955) 76.

5. See further E. Earle Ellis, *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989; reprint, Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1997) 40-44.

6. See also Rom 6:3-5; Gal 3:27; and Eph 5:30.

7. Hans Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (trans. John Bowden; New York: Harper & Row, 1969) 180; idem, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (ed. George W MacRae; trans. James W. Leitch; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 112; Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. Kendrick Grobel; New York: Scribner's, 1951) 1.209; Robinson, *Body*, 52; Russell Philip Shedd, *Man in Community: A Study of St. Paul's Application of Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964) 160.

8. E. Earle Ellis, "Sōma in First Corinthians," *Int* 44 (1990) 140.

only one partner is a believer (7:12-16). Significantly, Paul attributes to the Lord his instructions about the first situation: "To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord" (7:10). He probably refers to the teachings of Jesus that are recorded in Matt 19:3-9 (= Mark 10:2-9)⁹ and that are deeply rooted in Gen 2:24. If so, Paul's teaching on divorce is basically the same as that of Jesus: marriage creates an ontological "one flesh" unity between the two participants, and this unity is real and intended to be permanent.¹⁰

The second situation, Paul's teaching on mixed marriages between the believer and the nonbeliever (1 Cor 7:12-16), is especially relevant for our topic, for it expresses a strong sense of corporate solidarity. This is particularly true in 7:14, where Paul provides reasons why the believing partner should not separate from the unbelieving spouse: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified through (ἐν) his wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified through (ἐν) her husband. Otherwise, your children would be unclean, but as it is they are holy."

This statement raises a number of difficult exegetical questions: (1) What do the words "sanctified" and "holy" mean? (2) How and to what extent is the unbelieving spouse "sanctified" through the believing partner? (3) Who are "your children," and in what sense are they holy? Whatever the answers to these questions might be, Paul seems to employ here, as Bruce and Rosner argue,¹¹ the OT principle of holiness by association: "Whatever touches it [the altar] becomes holy" (for example, Exod 29:37; 30:29). In 1 Corinthians 7, the "one flesh" marriage union sanctifies the unbelieving spouse. The familial corporate sphere is not limited to the union of husband and wife; it also extends to their children: "they are holy" (1 Cor 7:14). The fundamental concept that underlies Paul's teachings on divorce is, therefore, the ontological corporate solidarity in marriage that includes not only the husband and wife but also their children.¹²

Ephesians 5:21-33

Paul relates Gen 2:24 explicitly to the marriage union in Eph 5:21-33, a passage that has frequently been employed in the discussion

9. Cf. Matt 5:31-32; Luke 16:18.

10. The term *ontological* is used here in the sense of "real," meaning that Paul's use of "one flesh (body)" is not merely a metaphorical expression but refers to a reality that does not necessarily have to be physical.

11. So, F. E. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1971) 69; Brian S. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of I Corinthians 5-7* (Leiden: Brill, 1994) 169-70. Cf. D. Daube, "Pauline Contributions to a Pluralistic Culture: Re-creation and Beyond," *Jesus and Man's Hope* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1971) 232-41.

12. So, Rosner, *Paul*, 169-70.

both of the relationship between husband and wife in marriage and also of the relationship between Christ and the church. His repeated use of the comparative particles ὡς καθὼς/ὡς . . . οὕτως provides a key to explain the literary structure of the passage. In the diagram below, column A represents the relationship between husband and wife, while column B represents the relationship between Christ and the church.

<i>Column A</i>	<i>Column B</i>
5:21 <i>Introduction or transition</i> (Submit to one another in the fear of the Lord)	
<i>Exhortation To Wives (5:22-24)</i>	
5:22a <i>Appeal for submission</i> (Wives, [submit] to your own husbands)	
5:23a Reason for submission 23b (for the husband is the head of the wife)	<i>Model follows</i> (as Christ is the head of the church)
5:24b <i>Re-appeal for submission</i> (So wives [submit] to their husbands)	
<i>Exhortation to Husbands (5:25-33)</i>	
5:25a <i>Appeal for love</i> (Husbands, love your wives)	25b-27 <i>Model precedes</i> (as Christ loved the church . . .)
5:28-29a <i>Re-appeal for love</i> (So husbands should love their wives as [being] their own bodies. . . . For no man ever hates his own flesh but nourishes and cherishes it)	29b-30 <i>Model follows</i> (as Christ [does] the church because we are members of his body)
5:31 <i>Appeal to scripture</i> (Gen 2:24) 32 (For this reason . . .)	<i>Implications for the relationship of Christ and the church</i> (This mystery is great, and I am speaking of Christ and the church)
5:33 <i>Concluding exhortation to husbands and wives</i> (Let each one of you love his wife as himself, and let the wife reverence her husband)	

Paul's instructions consist of two subsections: (1) instructions for wives (5:22-24) and (2) instructions for husbands (5:25-33). They are given in the format of the household code common to first-century

Judaism and to the hellenistic world, but they are based on scripture¹³ and are christologically reshaped.¹⁴

Paul exhorts wives to submit to their husbands and husbands to love their wives as being their own bodies.¹⁵ He finds the reason for the wife's submission in the headship of her husband and the reason for the husband's love of his wife in the concept of the "one flesh" union between husband and wife in marriage, a concept that is rooted in the teaching of Gen 2:24.

A question often arises whether Gen 2:24 in Paul's argument relates only to the "one body" union between husband and wife (5:25-29) or whether it also relates to the headship of the husband over his wife (5:22-24). J. P. Sampley, for example, argues that Gen 2:24 relates to the whole passage (5:22-31). He points to the following evidence: first, the presence of organic terms in both sections, "one flesh" in Eph 5:31 (citing Gen 2:24) and "head" in 5:23; second, the widespread early Christian literary pattern that connects injunctions for subordination (5:22) with some texts from the Pentateuch.¹⁶ Miletic accepts this view and argues further that Paul's exhortations both for subordination (5:22-24) and for unity (5:25-29) are derived from his and Jewish forms of theological speculation about Adam.¹⁷ If in the wider context "subordination" and "unity" are theologically

13. The scriptural citations in Ephesians include Gen 2:24 in Eph 5:31 and Exod 20:12 (Deut 5:16) in Eph 6:2-3. J. P. Sampley (*And the Two Shall Become One Flesh: A Study of Tradition in Ephesians 5:21-33* [SNTSMS 16; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971] 30-34), argues that Lev 19:18 also underlies Paul's statement in 5:28-29 and 33a. The combination of the instruction for wives' submission and a reference to Torah occurs also in 1 Cor 11:3-4, 7-9; 14:34; and in 1 Tim 2:11-14.

14. The christological reshaping is evident in the qualifying phrases: wives are instructed to submit to their husbands as *to the Lord* (5:22), children to obey their parents in the Lord (6:1), and slaves to obey their earthly masters as to Christ (Lord) and as servants of Christ (6:5-6). Likewise, husbands are instructed to love their wives as Christ loved the church (5:25), parents to bring up their children in the discipline and instruction of the Lord (6:4), and masters to treat their slaves with good will, knowing that they also have a master in heaven, that is, Christ (6:9).

15. The phrase ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα in 5:28 can also mean "as you love your own bodies," but this can hardly be the meaning here. In view of 5:23, where the wife is implied as the body of her husband, and of Gen 2:24 cited in 5:31, which declares the "one flesh" union of husband and wife, it seems more accurate to translate the phrase "as being your own bodies." So Best, *One Body*, 177; Ellis, *Pauline Theology*, 41; T. K. Abbott, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians and to the Colossians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897) 170-71; Markus Barth, *Ephesians: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on Chapters 1-3* (AB 34A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974) 629-30; Franz Mussner, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1982) 159. Otherwise, see Andrew T. Lincoln (*Ephesians* [ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W Baker; WBC 42; Dallas: Word, 1990] 378), who insists that the phrase must mean "as you love yourself."

16. Sampley, *One Flesh*, 32-34, 113-16.

17. Stephen Francis Miletic, *One Flesh: Eph 5.22-24, 5.30: Marriage and the New Creation* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1988) 25-98.

linked, they are probably also linked in Eph 5:22-33. Consequently, Miletic concludes, Gen 2:24 relates to the whole passage.

These arguments are, however, not fully convincing for the following reasons: First, Paul's citation of Gen 2:24 is directly related to the section in which he exhorts husbands to love their wives as being their own bodies. The replacement of σώματα with σάρξ in Eph 5:29 clearly prepares a way for the citation of Gen 2:24 in 5:31 and thus connects the Genesis citation to the immediately preceding verses (5:29-30). Second, the basic concept underlying Gen 2:24 is the "one flesh" union between husband and wife in marriage and not subordination. It is true that Paul's concept of the headship of the husband over his wife is also grounded in certain Genesis passages, but it appears in Paul's citation of Gen 1:27-28; 2:18-22; 3:6, 13 and not in his use of Gen 2:24.¹⁸ In this respect, Lincoln's critique of both Sampley and Miletic seems accurate:

I do not assume that subordination has nothing to do with mutuality, nor dispute that the two notions can be combined theologically, nor deny that the writer holds them both together in this passage. I simply dispute that the quotation from Gen 2:24 performs this function in the writer's argument. Instead, it functions in a more limited way and is brought in to make his point about only one of these notions—the mutual "one flesh" relationship.¹⁹

Third, although the image of the body and that of the head are closely related in the Ephesian letter, they are not one and the same imagery. The passage implies that the wife is in some sense the body of her husband, but "there is no suggestion that the wife forms the rump or trunk of the body of which the husband is the head."²⁰ Ellis succinctly summarizes this understanding in his comment on Eph 5:23: "The imagery is not 'head and torso,' but rather the leader or ruler and the 'body' that is distinct from him but that is nonetheless subject to his lordship and included under the umbrella of his corporate person."²¹ In other words, in Paul's imagery "head" is not an organic term for a part of the individual body. An exegetical confusion arises when one attempts to import into the texts a "head and torso" imagery or to treat the two images as though they were one.²² One may safely conclude, therefore, that Paul's citation of Gen 2:24

18. See 1 Cor 11:7-9; 1 Tim 2:13-14; and 2 Cor 11:3.

19. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 361.

20. Best, *One Body*, 179.

21. Ellis, *Pauline Theology*, 41.

22. Cf. Ernst Percy, *Der Leib Christi (soma Christou) in den paulinischen Homologoumena und Antilegomena* (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift; Lund: Harrassowitz, 1942) 52-54; Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (trans. John Richard de Witt; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 379-83.

qualifies only the second section of Eph 5:21-33, which deals with the "one flesh" relationship of husband and wife (5:25-33).

Paul explains here the relationship between husband and wife in analogy with the relationship between Christ and the church—namely, the unity of Christ and the church and the headship of Christ over the church. His use of the comparative particles ὡς and καθὼς/ὡς . . . οὕτως (5:22, 23, 24, 25, 28-29) indicates the shift from one relationship to the other. That is, wives are to submit to their husbands (5:22, 24b) as (ὡς) the church submits to Christ (5:24a) because the husband is the head of the wife as (ὡς) Christ is the head of the church (5:23). Correspondingly, husbands are to love their wives sacrificially (5:25, 28) as (καθὼς) Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her; they are to nourish and cherish them because their wives are their own bodies, just as (καθὼς) believers are members of Christ's body (5:29-30).²³

The sexual union between husband and wife and the spirit union between Christ and the church are related typologically to the sexual union between Adam and Eve (Gen 2:24). As mathematical ratios, the connection may be expressed as follows: husband/wife = Christ/church = Adam/Eve. The sexual union between husband and wife is explained in the framework of the spirit union between Christ and the church, and both are explained on the analogy of the sexual union between Adam and Eve, in which "the two shall become one flesh" (Gen 2:24).

A number of implications can be drawn from the above equations: (1) The wife is the body of her husband not only as Eve was "one flesh" with Adam (Gen 2:24)²⁴ but also as the church is the body of Christ (1 Cor 12:27). (2) By the same analogy, Eve may be regarded as the body of Adam (Eph 5:28-29) and (3) the church as the bride of Christ (2 Cor 11:2-3; cf. Eph 5:25-27). (4) The concept underlying these equations is basically twofold: (a) the ontological "one flesh/spirit" union created in marriage between Adam and Eve, between husband and wife, and between Christ and the church, and (b) the headship of Adam over Eve, of the husband over his wife, and of Christ over his church.

Related Passages

A number of Pauline passages clarify Paul's teaching in Eph 5:21-33, particularly his concept of the headship of the husband over his wife.

23. The image of Christ nourishing his body (the church) is clearly seen in Eph 4:11-16 and Col 2:19.

24. See Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 354; Ellis, *Pauline Theology*, 41-42.

For example, 1 Cor 11:2-16 refers to the headship of the male/husband (ἀνὴρ),²⁵ of Christ, and of God in the context of the practical issue of the head covering in worship (1 Cor 11:2-16).²⁶ 1 Corinthians 11 is probably a pre-formed tradition that extends the household code on the relationship between husband and wife to a church situation.²⁷ If so, the teaching of the passage is intended primarily for husband and wife and not for man and woman in general.

The interpretation of the passage is difficult (1) because Paul's logic is not easy to follow, (2) because the precise meaning of certain terms (for example, "veil," "authority on her head") is uncertain, and (3) because the customs referred to in the passage are obscure to modern readers. Whether the veil refers to an external head covering²⁸ or to long or loosed hair,²⁹ Paul insists that a woman, but not a man, should cover her head when she prays or prophesies. The reason is found in 11:3: "The head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is the husband, and the head of Christ is God." The phrase κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ is almost identical to the phrase in Eph 5:23a: ἀνὴρ ἔστιν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός.

25. The RSV translates ἀνὴρ "husband," while the KJV and NIV translate it "man."

26. 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 has often been discussed in conjunction with Gal 3:28 in regard to Paul's view of the relationship of man and woman. Scholars who think that Paul teaches the eradication of gender distinctions in Gal 3:28 often think that his teaching in 1 Cor 11:2-16 contradicts the teaching of Gal 3:28.

27. E. Earle Ellis ("Traditions in First Corinthians," *NTS* 32 (1986) 493-94) offers the following features as evidence: (1) 1 Cor 11:2-16 is prefaced by a reference to a tradition previously "delivered" to them and begins with an introductory formula, θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι ὅτι (1 Cor 11:1-2). (2) It concludes with an implicit claim that the teaching or practices advocated in the pericope were customs in "the churches of God" (11:16). (3) The teaching is closely packed, with an oscillation in the meaning of "head" and "man" and with allusions to an exegesis of Gen 1-3 similar to the one in 1 Cor 14:34-35; Eph 5:21-33; and 1 Tim 2:11-3:1a. (4) It is a self-contained piece with a considerable number of Pauline hapaxes. (5) It interrupts the immediate flow of thought. See William O. Walker ("1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and Paul's Views regarding Women," *JBL* 94 [1975] 94-110), who regards the passage as a non-Pauline interpolation; and Jerome Murphy-O'Connor ("The Non-Pauline Character of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16?" *JBL* 95 [1976] 615-21), who argues against Walker and affirms the passage's authenticity.

28. Most scholars think that the veil refers to a head covering. For example, see Bruce K. Waltke, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," *BSac* 135 (1978) 46-57.

29. William J. Martin, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F F Bruce on His Sixtieth Birthday* (ed. W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970) 233; James B. Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981) 168-71; Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origin* (New York: Crossroad, 1984) 227-29. Alan Padgett ("Paul and Women in the Church: The Contradiction of Coiffure in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *JSNT* 20 [1984] 70) argues that it refers to some sort of hair.

The word "head" here probably denotes "leadership" or "authority"³⁰ that requires the submission of the corresponding member. "Head" has this meaning in other Pauline texts: Because Christ is the head over all things (Eph 1:22; Col 2:10),³¹ all men shall bow to his name (Phil 2:10; Rom 14:11), and all things are subject to his authority and must eventually be put under his feet (1 Cor 15:24-27). Because Christ is the head of the church (Eph 4:15; 5:23; Col 1:18; 2:19), the church must submit to him (Eph 5:24). For God the Father to be Christ's "head" (1 Cor 11:3) means that Christ subjects himself (ὑποτάσσει) to God the Father (1 Cor 15:28). Likewise, for the husband to be the head of his wife (1 Cor 11:3; Eph 5:23) means that wives are to submit themselves to their husbands (Eph 5:22). Understood in light of this pattern, the "authority" that woman (that is, a wife) should put over her head (1 Cor 11:10) probably refers to the "headship" or "leadership" of her husband, and it may, as Foerster argues,³² symbolize her submission to his leadership.

In 1 Cor 11:7-9 Paul appeals to the Genesis creation accounts for his concept of the headship of the husband over his wife (Gen 1:26-27; 2:21-22). He points out three reasons why a man should not cover his head: (1) Man (the husband) is the image and glory of God, but woman (the wife) is the glory of man (her husband). (2) Man was not made from woman but woman from man. (3) Neither was man created for woman but woman for man. The basis for Paul's concept of the headship of the husband over his wife is, therefore, the preeminence and priority of the male in creation and the original purpose of the creation of woman.³³ Similarly, in Col 1:8 headship is joined to

30. So, Hurley, *Man and Woman*, 166-67; Wayne Grudem, "Does κεφαλή ('Head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples," *TJ* n.s. 6 (1985) 56-57; Ellis, *Pauline Theology*, 60. However, see S. Bedale, "The Meaning of κεφαλή in the Pauline Epistles," *JTS* 5 (1954) 211-15; Morna Hooker, "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of I Cor XI.10," *NTS* 10 (1964) 410-11; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Harper's New Testament Commentaries; New York: Harper & Row, 1968) 248; Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 103; Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (ed. F. E. Bruce; NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 105; and Robin Scroggs ("Paul and the Eschatological Woman," *JAAR* 40 [1972] 300-301), who understand "head" in the sense of "source."

31. The two clauses in Eph 1:22 are coordinate and virtually equivalent: to "subject" (ὑποτάσσει) all things to Christ is to make him "head" (κεφαλή) over all things.

32. So, W. Foerster, "ἔξουσία," in *TDNT* 2.573-74. However, compare Hooker ("Authority on Her Head," 414-16), who argues that the veil does not symbolize woman's subordination to the man, but it is demanded to hide the glory of man in the presence of God. This view is also accepted by Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 106; and by James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 590; but rejected by Walker, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16," 52-53.

33. So, Hurley, *Man and Woman*, 171-74; Ellis, *Pauline Theology*, 60. Otherwise, Scroggs, "Eschatological Woman," 300-301; and Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 515.

the idea of preeminence and priority. Thus, Paul's description of Christ as the "head" (κεφαλή) of the church is coupled to Christ as the "beginning" (ἀρχή) and the "firstborn (πρωτότοκος) from the dead" (Col 1:18).

A corresponding pattern, combining the wife's submission with a reference to the Genesis accounts of Adam and Eve, appears again in 1 Tim 2:8-3:1a. A couple of distinctions are noticeable, however: (1) Paul makes no direct reference in this passage to the headship of the husband over his wife. (2) The reason for the wife's submission is not only the priority of Adam over Eve in creation but also that she, not Adam, was deceived (2:13-14).³⁴ An allusion to the serpent's deception of Eve also appears in 2 Cor 11:2-3, where Paul discusses the relationship between Christ and the church in the image of a bridegroom and a bride. The bridal image is most evident in 2 Cor 11:2: "I betrothed you [the Corinthian church] to Christ to present you as a pure bride to her one husband." The underlying image corresponds well to the image of Eph 5:26-27: "that he [Christ] might sanctify her [the church], having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the church to himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, that she might be holy and without blemish."

The analysis of the Pauline passages that reflect or allude to Paul's view of the "one flesh (body)" union yields the following conclusions: (1) Paul thinks that sexual intercourse creates a real and ontological "one flesh" union between the two participants, whether it is between a believer and a prostitute or between a husband and a wife. (2) He bases this understanding on the teaching of Gen 2:24. (3) Likewise, he thinks that the believer's union with Christ creates an equally ontological corporate body that is as real as the union created by sexual intercourse. (4) He closely relates the "one flesh" concept to his view of the husband as the head of his wife and of Christ as the head of the church, a concept that is rooted in the Genesis accounts that teach the priority and preeminence of the male in creation (Gen 1:27-28; 2:18-22). (5) He compares the relationship between husband and wife to that between Christ and the church and relates both of them to the Genesis accounts of Adam and Eve. As a result, the following ratios emerge: Adam/Eve (sexual union) = husband/wife (sexual union) = Christ/the church (Spirit union) = head/body. These ratios are significant because they show that Paul's "one flesh (body)" concept is closely related to his Adam-Christ typology and to his concept of Christ as the head of the church and of the church as his body.

34. Cf. Gen 1:27; 2:7, 22; 3:6, 13.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The implications of Paul's usage involve the following questions: What does the "one flesh" union created by sexual intercourse denote? Does it simply refer to the temporary union of two individual bodies in sexual intercourse or to something more than that? The answers to these questions heavily depend on how one understands Paul's use of the terms σῶμα, σάρξ, and πνεῦμα in reference to the "one flesh" union. Most scholars rightly affirm that σῶμα and σάρξ are used synonymously in 1 Cor 6:12-20 and in Eph 5:21-33.³⁵ Since ἐν/πνεῦμα in 1 Cor 6:17 stands in parallelism with ἐν σῶμα and μὴ σάρξ in the foregoing verse (1 Cor 6:16), σῶμα and πνεῦμα are also in some respects equivalent.³⁶ Not every one agrees, however, about what σῶμα denotes in these texts. Gundry, for example, insists that, although σῶμα is essential to man's true and full being, it refers only to the physical frame of man.³⁷ Others, however, argue that σῶμα both in 1 Cor 6:12-20 and Eph 5:21-33 refers to the whole unified person.³⁸

One's definition of σῶμα basically determines the meaning of the phrase "one body (flesh)." For example, Gundry, who views σῶμα as referring only to the physical frame of man, argues that the somatic union between two human beings in 1 Cor 6:12-20 is not comprehensive, and thus, "one body" primarily refers to the temporary union of

35. σῶμα and σάρξ are often used interchangeably, but they are not completely identical. Paul probably follows the example of the LXX, in which בשר is rendered sometimes σῶμα and other times σάρξ, with no difference in meaning. For discussion on this matter, see Bultmann, *Theology*, 1.199-203; Robinson, *Body*, 26-33; Ellis, "Sōma," 133-34; and W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man in Relation to Its Judaic and Hellenistic Background* (London: Macmillan, 1956) 181-93.

36. This view is supported by Bultmann, *Theology*, 1.194-95; Best, *One Body*, 74-75; Robinson, *Body*, 28-29; Conzelmann, *Theology*, 176-77; Ellis, "Sōma," 133; Barnabas Mary Ahern, "The Christian's Union with the Body of Christ in Cor, Ga, and Rom," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 202; and Stacey, *Pauline View of Man*, 183.

37. Gundry, *Sōma*, 53.

38. For example, see Best, *One Body*, 74-75; Robinson, *Body*, 27-28; Ellis, "Sōma," 133-34; and Stacey, *Pauline View of Man*, 183. They offer the following reasons: (1) In 1 Cor 6:12-20 Paul substitutes σῶμα with the personal pronoun: "God . . . will raise us [= our bodies] up" (6:14); "You [your bodies] are not your own" (6:19). (2) His statement, "*Your bodies* are members of Christ" (6:15) is basically the same as saying, "We are members of the body of Christ" (Eph 5:30) or "*You* are the body of Christ and individually members of it" (1 Cor 12:27). (3) His statement, "*Your* body is the temple of the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor 6:19), is also similar to the saying, "*You* are the temple of God" (1 Cor 3:16) or "*We* are the temple of the living God" (2 Cor 6:16). (4) His exhortation, "Husbands should love their wives as *their own bodies* . . . ; for no one ever hated *his own flesh*" (Eph 5:28-29), probably means that husbands should love their wives as *themselves*.

two physical bodies in sexual intercourse.³⁹ Best, who views the word $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ as referring to the whole person, offers an exegesis quite different from that of Gundry. He argues that "one body" basically refers to the "corporate personality" that two persons form together by the sexual union. It, therefore, involves more than the momentary union of physical bodies in sexual intercourse.⁴⁰ J. A. T. Robinson, who shares an understanding of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ similar to that of Best, also thinks that "one body" refers to the single corporeity that the two unified persons create, but he conceives the "one body" union differently from Best: for Best it is something less than physical, but for Robinson it is physical in a realistic sense.⁴¹

Although it may be debatable whether "corporate personality" is a proper term to describe the sexual union regarded as "one body,"⁴² it is quite obvious that the "one body" union denotes something more than the temporary union of two physical bodies in sexual intercourse. It refers to a real and ontological corporate reality created by the sexual union of two unified persons.⁴³ Although it involves the union of physical bodies, it may not be only physical if one defines

39. Gundry, *Sōma*, 54.

40. Best, *One Body*, 74-75.

41. Robinson, *Body*, 50-55; cf. Best, *One Body*, 76.

42. A number of scholars have criticized the validity of the concept or term "corporate personality." They include J. R. Porter, "The Legal Aspects of the Concept of 'Corporate Personality' in the Old Testament," *VT* 15 (1965) 361-80; J. W. Rogerson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: A Re-examination," *JTS* 21 (1970) 7-10; Cyril S. Rodd, "Introduction to *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel*" (rev. ed. by H. W. Robinson; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981) 13; and more recently, A. C. Perriman, "The Corporate Christ: Reassessing the Jewish Background," *TynBul* (1999) 241-63; and Stanley E. Porter, "Two Myths: Corporate Personality and Language/Mentality Determinism," *SJT* 43 (1990) 289-307. Their criticism is rebutted by J. S. Kaminsky, *Corporate Responsibility in the Hebrew Bible* (JSOTSup 196; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995) 18-20, 188; Ellis, *Pauline Theology*, 9-10; and idem, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1978) 170 n. 89. See also my own interaction with them in "Corporate Elements," 88-90.

For a discussion of "corporate personality," see H. W. Robinson, *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel* (3d ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981); J. A. T. Robinson, *Body*; Aubrey R. Johnson, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God* (2d ed.; Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961); idem, *Sacral Kingship in Israel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955); Jean de Fraine, *Adam and the Family of Man* (trans. D. C. Raibe; Staten Island, N.Y.: Alba, 1965) 13-48; Shedd, *Man in Community*, 3-41; E. Earle Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), esp. pp. 110-16; idem, *Pauline Theology*, 8-13; 43-44; idem, "Sōma," 138-40; idem, *Christ and the Future*, 148-57, 171-72; and Kaminsky, *Corporate Responsibility*, esp. pp. 18-20; and my *Corporate Elements*, 83-88.

43. In support of this view, see Derrick S. Bailey, *The Mystery of Love and Marriage: A Study in the Theology of Sexual Relation* (London: SCM, 1952) 44,51-52.

the term *physical* as the visible, material, and outward substance of the individual man. The "one body," however, includes and is as real as the individual physical body. In fact, it is so real that becoming "one body" with a prostitute inevitably destroys one's "one body (spirit)" union with Christ. The realistic nature of the corporate union between husband and wife is also evident in Paul's assertion that the unbelieving spouse is sanctified through the believing partner in marriage (1 Cor 7:14).

An individual person can form a corporate "one body" union not only sexually with another individual but also spiritually with Christ.⁴⁴ This is evident in Paul's statement, "He who is united to the Lord is one spirit with him" (1 Cor 6:17). The corporate union with Christ is, however, not formed by sexual intercourse but by baptism "by one Spirit . . . into one body" (1 Cor 12:13). This may be the reason why Paul designates the union with Christ as "one spirit" (1 Cor 6:17) or "one body and one spirit" (Eph 4:4), while describing sexual union only as "one body" (1 Cor 6:16).

The corporate union with Christ has sometimes been understood as referring to the eradication of the individual's racial, social, and gender distinctions. Those who hold this view often appeal to Gal 3:27-28:⁴⁵ "For as many of you were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female (οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ); for you are all one (ἓν) in Christ Jesus."⁴⁶ Paul, however, does not teach in this passage that incorporation into Christ abrogates one's racial, social, and gender distinctions. He is primarily concerned here with the corporate unity of all believers in Christ that in some respects transcends and transforms but does not eradicate their racial, social, and gender distinctions.⁴⁷ He clarifies the

44. 1 Corinthians 6:17; 10:16-17; 12:12-13, 27; Rom 12:4-5; Eph 1:22-23; 3:6; 4:4, 11-16; 5:23, 30; Col 1:18; 1:24; 2:16-19; 3:15. For discussion of these passage in this respect, see my *Corporate Elements*, 94-126.

45. For example, Wayne A. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," *HR* 13 (1974) 185. See also Krister Stendahl, *The Bible and the Role of Women: A Case Study in Hermeneutic* (trans. Emilie T. Sander; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966) 32; and G. B. Caird, "Paul and Women's Liberty," *BJRL* 54 (1972) 268-81.

46. A similar expression also appears in Rom 10:12; 1 Cor 12:13; and Col 3:9-11. Interestingly, however, the "male and female" pair appears only here and in Jesus' teaching on divorce (Matt 19:3-9; Mark 10:2-12). For this reason, Ellis (*Pauline Theology*, 81) argues that "Paul probably has in mind Jesus' use of Genesis for understanding the marriage relationship and that he alters the wording apparently to conform it to Gen 2:24."

47. The phrases "baptized into Christ" and "put on Christ" in Gal 3:27 clearly denote believers' incorporation into Christ, thus becoming corporately the body of Christ and individually members of it. See Rom 6:3; 13:14; 1 Cor 12:13, 27; Eph 4:24; and Col 3:10-11.

teaching of Gal 3:28, with respect to the Jew/Greek clause, in Eph 2:11-3:6: "(Christ), who made the two (groups) one (ἐν) and broke down the dividing wall of hostility . . . that he might create the two (groups) into one new man in himself, thus making peace" (2:14-15). Paul's teaching in this passage is quite clear: in Christ Jesus the previously existing racial discrimination between Jew and Gentile (2:11-12), not racial distinction, is completely removed as Jews and Gentiles are brought into one corporate body. Similarly, in Rom 10:12 Paul declares that with regard to salvation through faith in Jesus the Messiah, "there is no distinction between Jew and Greek." His exhortation to Philemon to receive Onesimus as a beloved brother in the Lord (Phlm 16) also indicates that in some sense one's being in Christ transcends one's social status, but he does not obliterate the social distinction between Philemon (the free) and Onesimus (the slave). In Eph 5:21-33 he teaches that husband and wife become one body (flesh) in marriage, yet he emphasizes the distinction between husband and wife. The same principle probably underlies Gal 3:28: as believers are baptized into Christ and put on Christ, thus forming a corporate unity with other believers and with Christ, all the pre-existing discriminations based on their racial, social, and gender status are completely removed. But their individual distinctions remain.

What has been discussed above has far-reaching implications for Paul's view of man. It implies that Paul understands man as a being whose existence is not limited to his individual person. Although an individual man is separated from others by the limits of his physical body, his existence is by no means limited to himself. In certain respects his existence extends beyond his individual boundaries to form a corporate unity (body) with others and with Christ but without losing his individuality. Accordingly, man can form an ontological corporate body with a prostitute or with his wife by having a sexual relationship with her. Within the context of marriage, this corporate body extends to children, thus forming a familial solidarity. Likewise, by being joined to the Lord, human beings form one equally ontological corporate body with Christ. This means that in Paul's thought man exists not only individually but also corporately. This understanding of man both as an individual and as a corporate being has tremendous implications for Paul's view of Christ and of the church. It is probably this concept that underlies Paul's Adam-Christ typology,⁴⁸ his concept of the church as the body of

48. Adam and Christ are referred to explicitly in 1 Cor 15:20-28, 42-49, and Rom 5:12-21. Adam and Christ may also underlie Phil 2:5-11; Col 1:15-20; 3:9-10; Rom 1:18-32; and Eph 4:22-24. See the discussion in my *Corporate Elements*, 45-91.

Christ⁴⁹ and as the temple, building, or house of God,⁵⁰ and also his use of "in Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ)" and related phrases in which the preposition ἐν is used in a locative sense, thus denoting believers' corporate existence in Christ.⁵¹

49. Explicit references to the church as the body of Christ appear in 1 Cor 12:27; Eph 1:22-23; 5:30; Col 1:24. Besides these explicit references, possible allusions appear in 1 Cor 6:15, 17; 10:16; 11:24-29; Eph 4:12; and Col 2:17. The church is also identified as "one body in Christ" (Rom 12:5; cf. Eph 3:6), "the body" (Eph 5:23; Col 1:18), or simply "one body," without reference to Christ (1 Cor 10:17; Eph 2:16; 4:4; Col 3:15). See the discussion in my *Corporate Elements*, 92-136.

50. Explicit references to the church as the Temple appear in 1 Cor 3:16-17; 2 Cor 6:16; and Eph 2:21. The designation of the church as a building or house appears in 1 Cor 3:9; Eph 2:21; 1 Tim 3:15; and possibly 2 Cor 5:1-2. See the discussion in my *Corporate Elements*, 137-66.

51. *Ibid.*, 7-35.