

Sang-Won (Aaron) Son. *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology. A Study of Selected Terms, Idioms, and Concepts in the Light of Paul's Usage and Background.* Analecta Biblica 148. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2001, xvii + 240 pp., \$17.00.

This work appears to be a revision of a doctoral dissertation completed under Earle Ellis at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Son investigates Paul's corporate anthropology by examining 1) the "in Christ" formula in Paul; 2) the Adam-Christ parallel; 3) the church as the body of Christ, 4) Christ and the church as the temple, house, and building of God; 5) and the nature of the sexual union. These five subjects comprise the chapters of the book, which also includes an introduction and a conclusion plus two tables on the "in Christ formula."

Son recognizes that Paul's anthropology is wedded to other themes in Pauline theology, and hence he explores Paul's christology and ecclesiology to derive a Pauline anthropology. He notes that his approach is the reverse of Bultmann who moved from anthropology to other areas of Pauline theology. Fundamentally, Son adopts an inductive, exegetical approach, acknowledging that he is unable to unpack every detail in the texts examined. He accepts all thirteen Pauline letters as canonical, and hence does not limit his study to a critically assured minimum. It is refreshing to see someone who adopts an exegetical approach and is bold enough to argue for the authenticity of all thirteen Pauline letters.

Son begins with the "in Christ" formula in Paul. His presentation is compact and terse but meaty. The versatility of Greek prepositions makes it difficult to distinguish between the locative and instrumental uses, or even the dative of reference. Where the formula is used of persons, copulative verbs or expressions that denote "being in Christ" are usually locative, whereas active verbs may be either locative or instrumental. Non-personal expressions may be either locative or instrumental, though even in the latter instances the locative sense is not absent entirely, and hence he sees the locative notion is the most common. Son argues that the phrase "Christ in believers" is not simply another way of saying believers are "in Christ." Furthermore, he presents evidence to question whether being "in the Spirit" is equivalent to being "in Christ." On the basis of this latter point Son questions Deissmann's understanding of "in Christ," and criticizes him for understanding the expression in a non-personal way. Nor can "in Christ" merely be a way of saying that one is in the church since Paul distinguishes Christ from the church. Son concludes that "in Christ" "denotes the believer's existence in the 'corporate Christ.'" (p. 27). He recognizes that some scholars have questioned corporate solidarity, but argues that such a view explains the evidence better than other conceptions and that their comments counteract an uncritical understanding of corporate personality. In particular, the notion of corporate personality does not eradicate the individuality of believers, nor does it suggest that their individuality is absorbed in Adam or Christ. One must maintain both truths, that people are individuals and that they are corporate persons in Adam or Christ.

Does Paul's understanding of "in Christ" derive from mystery religions, Jewish apocalyptic writings, or the OT and the teaching of Jesus? Son dismisses the first two options, though he sees some common expressions and concepts Paul shared with Jesus and the OT. He turns at this point to Paul's Adam christology. The Adam-Christ parallel should be understood typologically in which there are correspondences in history.

Hence, it follows that both Adam and Christ are genuine historical persons, and cannot be identified merely as symbols. Most important, Son maintains that all of humanity is included in Adam Christ as corporate persons (1 Cor 15:20-28; 15:42-29; Rom 5:12-21; Phil 2:5-11; Col 1:15-20; 3:9-10; Rom 1:18-32; Gal 3:27-29; Eph 4:22-24). One could quarrel with his exegesis here and there. For instance, I remain unconvinced that we have a reference to Adam in Rom 1:18-32. Nevertheless, the main point is convincingly made. Son is cautious, arguing that Paul does not specify how it is that Adam and Christ determine the existence of human beings, though it is clear that Paul views humanity as in solidarity with Adam and Christ. Son then explores the derivation of Paul's notion that Christ and Adam were corporate persons. Possible answers include the Gnostic "Primal Man" myth; Jewish Adam speculations; the "Son of Man"; the OT conception of corporate personality; and Paul's Damascus road vision. Son believes that the OT notion of corporate personality provides the most satisfactory answer.

Paul's corporate understanding is communicated in his theology of the church as the body of Christ. Is Paul speaking of the church as Christ's body metaphorically or realistically? Some scholars, such as Schweitzer and J. A. T. Robinson, have understood the statement realistically and physically. Ridderbos and Percy emphasize the redemptive-historical character of the unity of believers and Christ. Bultmann maintains that the church is really the body of Christ, but understands it in terms of existential philosophy. Son argues that Paul's usage cannot be confined to metaphor and should be interpreted realistically and ontologically. He acknowledges that in one sense believers are the body of Christ and in another sense they can be distinguished from him. Christ has a physical body that is not identical with the church. But Christ is not only an individual person but also a corporate person, and in the latter sense the church is part of his body. What Son means when he says that the church is "really" and "ontologically" Christ's body is unclear. He does not provide any clear definitions of these terms. Hence, it is difficult to know what it means to say that the church is "ontologically" Christ's body in his scheme. He rightly guards against the view that individuality is swallowed up by corporate christology, and we acknowledge the difficulty of Paul's thought here. Still, Son leaves us with a rather vague definition.

Son follows his method and inquires about the source of the conception of the church as Christ's body. Possible sources include Stoicism, the Gnostic "Primal Man" myth; the apocalyptic conception of the solidarity of the elect with the Messiah; the rabbinic speculations on the body of Adam; the eucharist; the OT and the teachings of Jesus. Son concludes that the evidence is limited and that we cannot settle definitively on any particular background, though some of the possible antecedents are ruled out definitively (Stoicism, Gnosticism, the apocalyptic and rabbinic backgrounds).

Paul also uses terms like "temple," "house," and "building" in a corporate and individual sense. We must discern from context which is in view. The background for this conception has been located in Hellenistic writings; Qumran texts; and the teaching of Jesus. Son rejects the idea that it can be traced to Stoic or Philonic notions of man as a temple. Neither can the Qumran background be firmly established, and hence Son concludes that the notion comes from pre-Pauline traditions that reach back to Jesus' own temple teaching.

In the final chapter Son explores the nature of the sexual union. 1 Corinthians 6:12-20 suggests that union with Christ is as real as sexual union. Being one spirit with

Christ in this text "refers to the corporate body of Christ created by the Spirit-baptism into Christ" (p. 149). But is the latter a legitimate deduction from 1 Cor 6:12-20 where Paul speaks of the bodies of individual believers as the temple of God's Spirit? Son also says that sexual union with a prostitute creates "a real and ontological union with her" (p. 148). But again I am unsure what he means by "real" and "ontological." Certainly Paul communicates that sexual union is anything but casual, and communicating the significance of what Paul says is complex, but Son's own formulation suffers from lack of clarity. Son does rightly say that the one-flesh union is not merely "the temporary union of two physical bodies" (p. 164). In Eph 5:21-33 Son understands the language of the husband as the head of the wife metaphorically rather than organically. He maintains that what is primarily in Paul's mind is parenesis—the exhortations to husbands and wives. He is probably right in saying this, but that does not resolve the question whether the Christ-church relation is paradigmatic for the husband-wife relationship or vice-versa. Son closes the chapter by arguing that the background for Paul's teaching on the sexual union derives from the OT and the teaching of Jesus, not the Hellenistic and Gnostic androgyne myths, nor Jewish androgynous views of the Genesis creation accounts.

To sum up, this is a fine study on corporate anthropology in Paul. Son has researched the question carefully and assesses various views and presents his own exegesis compactly. He rightly emphasizes the corporate dimensions in Paul's thought and is careful to say that such an emphasis does not cancel out the importance of individuality.

Thomas R. Schreiner

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Louisville, Kentucky